DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 138 CG 011 176

AUTHOR Beesley, Earl G.; And Others
TITLE Improving Student Attitudes in Three Elementary Schools Through a Life Leadership Program. Maxi 1 Practicum.
PUB DATE 13 Jul 76
NOTE 109p.; Ed. D. Dissertation, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; Decision Making Skills; *Dropout Prevention; Elementary Education; *Leadership Training; Program Descriptions; *School Environment; *Student Attitudes; *Student Leadership; *Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this practicum was to improve elementary student attitudes toward school, teachers, and administrators through implementation of a LIFE Leadership Program. The program was implemented in three Dallas Independent School District (DISD) elementary schools at the fourth-grade, fifth-grade, and sixth-grade levels. The same grade levels at three similar schools, located in the same general area as the experimental schools, served as controls. Comparison of experimental and control school pretest and post test data as well as their records of student behavior revealed positive effects of the program. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED 136 138

CG

AUG 2 5 1976

IMPROVING STUDENT ATTITUDES IN THREE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS THROUGH A LIFE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

by

Earl G. Beesley
Marcus R. Gifford
George H. Simms

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, Nova University

Dallas Cluster II
Dr. William Webster

Maxi I Practicum
July 13, 1976

CG011176

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iv
Introduction	1
Identification of Needs	2
Statement of Objectives	6
Strategy for Achievement of Objectives	11
Selection of Experimental and Control Schools	11
Selection of Experimental and Control School Grade Levels	22
Description of Secondary-level LIFE Leadership Program	24
Adaptation of the Secondary LIFE Leadership Program to the Elementary Level	34
Pre-Planning	36
Selection and Administration of Evaluation Instrument	40
Teacher Training Workshops	41
Implementation of the Practicum	56
Pretesting and Introduction	56
Implementing the LIFE Leadership Program in the Classroom	57
Posttesting	80
Evaluation	80
Purpose of the Evaluation	80
Evaluation Design	81
Evaluation Instruments	81
Elementary Pupil Questionnaire	81
Disciplinary Records	82
Observations	82

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Test Dates 82

Criteria 82

Collection of Data 84

Analysis of Data 88

Table I 92

Elementary Pupil Questionnaire Results

Table II 93

Participant Gains from Pretest to Posttest

Table III 94

Incidents of Negative Student Behavior of Participating Students Experimental Schools

Conclusions 95

Summary 102

Bibliography 103

Table of Contents (continued)

Appendix A

Pre- and Posttest Instrument

Appendix B

Puzzle

Appendix C

Classroom Climate Student Responsibility

Appendix D

LIFE Leadership Booklets

Elementary Life Leadership

Expectations of Self and Others

Citizenship and Youth

Pride and Responsibility

Do Something Beautiful

Appendix E

Student Referral to Principal's Office

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this practicum was to improve elementary student attitudes toward school, teachers, and administrators through implementation of a LIFE Leadership Program. The program was implemented in three Dallas Independent School District (DISD) elementary schools at the fourth-grade, fifth-grade, and sixth-grade levels. The same grade levels at three similar schools, located in the same general area as the experimental schools, served as controls.

Comparison of experimental and control school pretest and posttest data as well as their records of student behavior revealed positive effects of the program. Plans have been made to expand the program to four other DISD elementary schools during the 1975-76 school year. The program will be transported intact at these four schools.

INTRODUCTION

For some time teachers and administrators in the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) had voiced concern about negative student attitudes. These negative student attitudes were indicated by the increasing number of underachievers and early dropouts as well as by increased disrespect toward teachers and administrators.

In the DISD elementary schools there were no programs to improve student attitudes through teacher-student efforts. In light of the attitudinal problem, which was apparent in the elementary schools, a decision was made to implement a LIFE Leadership Program in three DISD elementary schools.

A variety of LIFE Leadership Programs had already been designed and implemented in DISD secondary schools. Fortunately, the District had also already begun the process of selecting and revising elements of those secondary programs to make them suitable for implementation at the elementary level. The authors of this practicum were, therefore, able to incorporate such material into a LIFE Leadership Program to be implemented in their own elementary schools. They were also fortunate in being able to call upon the resources and experience of Mrs. Tulla Bussell, Coordinator of the LIFE Leadership Program in DISD secondary schools.

An elementary LIFE Leadership Program was thus designed and implemented in three DISD elementary schools: Seagoville Elementary, T. L. Marsalis Elementary, Nancy Cochran Elementary. Three other elementary schools with student enrollment, faculty number, geographic location, socioeconomic conditions, and ethnic make-up comparable to those of

the three experimental schools were selected as control schools to allow a comparison of pretest and posttest data.

Teachers were trained, evaluation instruments were selected, and the elementary LIFE Leadership Program was implemented in three DISD elementary schools in January 1975. After four and one-half months, the program in the experimental schools was evaluated. Comparison of data with that from the control schools indicated that the LIFE Leadership Program in the three experimental schools had been successful. As a result, it was decided not only that the program be continued in the experimental schools, but also that it be expanded to four other elementary schools during the 1975-76 school year.

IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

The problem of student attitudes toward school, toward teachers, and toward administrators has caused administrators across the nation much concern. Negative student attitudes are indicated by the increasing number of underachievers and early dropouts, as well as increased disrespect toward teachers and administrators. Dr. Louis Rubin spoke to these nationwide issues at a Nova Curriculum Study Module Cluster Meeting, noting that standardized test scores were continuing to drop, that one out of every five students entering school dropped out before graduation, and that over 3,000 attacks on teachers and administrators had occurred in the nation's schools last year.

Parents in all types of communities in general and in the three experimental schools (Marsalis, Seagoville, and Cochran) in particular, complained that their children did not want to go to school, did not like school work or homework, and did not seem to be motivated to achieve success in school. Student attitude was reflected in their

contacts with teachers, and their behavior was a reflection of their attitudes. Teachers in the three subject schools observed the following:

1. Classroom manners of students toward teachers and other students were going from bad to worse.
2. Negative student attitude was reflected in students' failure to bring necessary materials and books to class. They were left at home, in other rooms, or in their lockers. They seemed unconcerned when questioned by a teacher.
3. Negative student attitudes were reflected in their grades. Many were unconcerned about their grades.
4. Student attention to teachers' instructions reflected their attitude. Many were unconcerned about being able to do their work after teacher instruction. This attitude was often contagious, carrying over to other students within that classroom.
5. Students' not turning in their school work and homework also indicated their negative attitude. Teachers were experiencing great difficulty in getting students to do their school work and their homework.
6. Student tardiness and truancy also reflected negative attitudes toward school. Tardiness and truancy were on the upsurge in the District in general and the three subject schools of this practicum in particular.

As principals of Marsalis, Seagoville, and Cochran Elementary Schools respectively, the authors of this practicum had observed the following:

1. Office referrals-teacher referrals reflecting poor student attitudes.
2. Incidents such as the following were on the increase:
    a. Students fussing and fighting.
    b. Students disturbing class.
    c. Students tearing up other students' work.
    d. Students showing lack of respect for teachers.
    e. Name calling.
3. Increased numbers of suspensions when a student's behavior deteriorates to the point where he must be removed from the school setting, it obviously reflects that student's negative attitude. Suspensions were on the upsurge in the DISD and in the individual subject schools.
4. Increased incident of corporal punishment. When student involvement in particular activities result in a need for corporal punishment, negative attitudes are again clearly reflected. Incidents of corporal punishment were increasing in the DISD and in the individual subject schools. In many cases the following seemed to be true:
    a. many students refused corporal punishment
    b. many students were unaffected by corporal punishment
    c. in numerous cases, corporal punishment was not an effective deterrent
5. General lack of cleanliness around buildings and grounds

often reflects poor attitudes. Clear examples of such were:

a. excessive litter in halls and on grounds

b. defacing of restrooms, outside doors, and walls

Not only general observations but experimental school records revealed increases in the incidence of disruptive behavior. Table 3 (see page 94) reveals such specific data. Each school has records of incidents of negative student behavior. The more common examples of such include:

1. Teacher office referrals: any problem related to student behavior that warrants action by the principal.
2. Corporal punishment: physical application of a paddle on a student's buttocks.
3. Suspension: when a student's behavior deteriorates where he must be removed from the school setting for a period of one or more days.
4. Student fights: students hitting on each other such as to warrant referral to the principal.
5. Insubordination: students disobedient to teacher's authority, school rules, classroom rules and students disturbing the learning environment of the class and/or school.
6. Theft: taking money and other articles from other students' purses and from teachers' desk, taking lunches and articles of clothing from lockers and so on.

7. Extortion: threatening students in order to get money from them.

8. Vandalism: deliberate defacing of walls, floors and furniture and breakage of windows.

Generally, all teachers and principals follow the same criteria for referrals. However, the authors realize there is some variance among individuals regarding insubordination. What is considered disobedience or disturbance of the learning environment by one individual might be overlooked by another individual.

Like other cities, Dallas has found negative attitudinal problems to be compounded by desegregation court orders which often realign professional staffs and reassign students to teachers and administrators with ethnic and cultural backgrounds different from their own. In some cities parental reaction to court orders has affected school adjustment negatively. Thus, though desegregation might ultimately broaden the educational base and lead to a desirable cultural exchange, it has sometimes unfortunately stimulated negative attitudinal change on the part of some students.

As administrators, the present authors realized that this practicum would not totally eliminate the negative attitudes on the part of students. The practicum, however, was an effort to implement a program that would at least help improve the overall attitude of students toward schools, teachers, and administrators.

STATEMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES

The authors of this practicum were of the opinion that a program aimed at improving student attitudes at the elementary level would meet the needs identified earlier in this report. Such a program,

to be successful, would involve the students as active participants in the planning and implementation of the program rather than assigning them roles as passive participants cast in a receiving capacity only.

For several years such a program had been in operation at the secondary level. That secondary program is called LIFE, an acronym for Leaders Interested in the Future of Education. The underlying concept of the program is student involvement, focusing on problems rather than people. The program was implemented at the secondary level when the problem of student attitudes threatened to undermine the effectiveness of the secondary schools.

A detailed description of the secondary LIFE Leadership Program is presented on page 24 of this practicum. The program eventually became the LIFE Leadership Program and was staffed and funded by the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) as an integral part of the secondary school curriculum.

The practicum authors contacted Mrs. Tulla Bussell, Coordinator of the LIFE Leadership Program for the DISD. Fortunately, Mrs. Bussell had already begun revising materials used in the secondary LIFE program for use at the elementary level. The practicum authors decided to pilot the elementary LIFE Leadership Program in three DISD elementary schools: Seagoville Elementary School, Cochran Elementary School, and Marsalis Elementary School. The program involved some 700 students and 15 teachers at these three experimental schools.

Three other elementary schools in the DISD with student enrollments, faculty number, geographic location, socioeconomic conditions

and ethnic composition comparable to those of the three experimental schools were selected as controls. These schools were: Kleberg Elementary (Seagoville control), Mark Twain Elementary (Marsalis control), and Winnetka Elementary (Cochran control). The demographic data and teacher profiles for both the experimental schools and control schools are given on the following pages.

The demographic information for experimental and control schools includes:

1. Average Daily Attendance: The average number of students attending school on any given day during the 1973-74 school year. The total number of students in attendance on each school day was summed over the number of school days in the 1973-74 school year and divided by the number of school days in that school year.
2. Average Daily Membership: The average number of students actively enrolled on any given day during the 1973-74 school year.
3. Attendance Ratio: The number of students in attendance on any given day per 100 of the average daily membership during the 1973-74 school year.
4. Ethnic Composition: Percentages of Anglo and minority population in the school community "minority" includes Black, Mexican-American, and other ethnicities.
5. Average Parental Education Level: The average educational level reached by adult heads of families in the school community.

6. Average Housing Evaluation: The average evaluation of houses in the school community.

7. Average Apartment Rental: The average range of apartment rents in the school community. (Several of the school communities do not have apartment rentals.)

8. Zoning Classification: Zoning classifications within each school community are provided by the Legal Department of the Building Inspection Division of the City of Dallas. The predominant zoning classification is then selected to represent the community.

9. Socioeconomic Status Indicator: The socioeconomic status indicator is derived from the mean housing valuation, mean apartment rental, and mean-median years of education.

These data regarding all DISD schools, in general, and the experimental and control schools of this practicum, in particular, are computed for and made available in the annual DISD Management Profiles, prepared by the DISD Department of Research, Evaluation, and Information Systems.

The general objective of this practicum was to improve student attitudes toward school, teachers, and administrators at the experimental schools by implementing the elementary LIFE Leadership Program in pilot classes at the fourth-grade, fifth-grade and sixth-grade levels. The specific objectives of the practicum were:

1. to raise the scores of experimental school participants in the LIFE Leadership Program on an attitudinal test administered as a pre- and post-practicum measure,
2. to improve the attitudes of 75 percent of the students in the participating grades of the experimental schools,

3. to decrease at the experimental schools those indicators of negative student attitudes such as corporal punishment, suspension, theft, vandalism, fighting, extortion, and insubordination.

The authors of this practicum rationalized that the 75 percent of the students showing improvement of their attitudes from pretest to posttest was a positive and obtainable objective.

The practicum authors were of the opinion that the credibility of the elementary LIFE Leadership Program would be established if the following occurred:

1. That on an attitudinal test administered as a pre- and post-practicum measure to students in the participating grades of the experimental schools and students in matching grades at the control schools, the posttest mean scores of experimental students would be higher than posttest mean scores of students at the control schools.
2. That 75 percent of the experimental students would show a positive increase from pretest to posttest on the attitudinal test.
3. That experimental school records would show considerable decrease in those indicators of negative student attitude such as corporal punishment, suspension, theft, vandalism, fighting, extortion, and insubordination.

4. That comparison of experimental and control school records of these indicators of negative student attitudes would help confirm that the experimental school decrease of such indicators was indeed an effect of the elementary LIFE Leadership Program.

STRATEGY FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

Selection of Experimental and Control Schools

The authors of this practicum selected Seagoville Elementary School, Marsalis Elementary School, and Cochran Elementary School as the experimental schools involved in the practicum because the authors served as principals of these three schools - Seagoville (George Simms), Marsalis (Earl Beesley), and Cochran (Marcus Gifford). The following pages give the demographic data and teacher profiles of the experimental and control schools and summarization of pertinent data used in selection of the participating schools.

Demographic Data of Experimental and Control Schools

School Year - 1973-74

	Seagoville (Experimental)	Kleberg (Control)
Average Daily Attendance	650	338
Average Daily Membership	699	366
Attendance Ratio	0.930	0.923

Socioeconomic Profile of the School Community

Ethnic Composition		
Anglo	80.85%	67.0%
Minority	19.15%	33.0%
Parental Education Level	9-11 years	9-11 years
Housing Valuation	$0-4,999	$0-4,999
Apartment Rental	(no apartment rentals)	
Major Zoning Classification	Single-family	Single-family
Socioeconomic Status Indicator	1-Lower	1-Lower

Demographic Data of Experimental and Control Schools

School Year - 1973-74

	Marsalis (Experimental)	Mark Twain (Control)
Average Daily Attendance	583	478
Average Daily Membership	608	513
Attendance Ratio	0.959	0.932

Socioeconomic Profile of the School Community

Ethnic Composition		
Anglo	1%	24.21%
Minority	99%	75.79%
Parental Education Level	12 years	12 years
Housing Valuation	$20,000-24,999	$15,000-19,999
Apartment Rental (Monthly)	$101-150	$101-150
Major Zoning Classification	Single-family	Single-fmily
Socioeconomic Status Indicator	2-Lower Middle	2-Lower Middle

Demographic Data of Experimental and Control Schools

School Year - 1973-74

	Cochran (Experimental)	Winnetka (Control)
Average Daily Attendance	420	397
Average Daily Membership	455	443
Attendance Ratio	0.923	0.896

Socioeconomic Profile of the School Community

Ethnic Composition		
Anglo	55%	56%
Minority	45%	44%
Parental Education Level	9-11 years	9-11 years
Housing Valuation	$20,000-24,999	$10,000-14,999
Apartment Rental (Monthly)	$101-150	$51-100
Major Zoning Classification	Single-family	Single-family
Socioeconomic Status Indicator	2-Lower Middle	1-Lower Middle

TEACHER PROFILE

Seagoville

Demographic Information

Category	Male	Female	Total
Number	0	27	27
Percent	0	100	100
Age		Percent	
26	0	15	15
26-35	0	26	26
36-45	0	19	19
46-55	0	7	7
56-65	0	33	33
-65	0	0	0
Race		Percent	
Anglo	0	74	74
Negro	0	26	26
Mexican-American	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0

Academic and Career Experience

Category	Male	Female	Total
Education Level (%)			
No Degree	0	0	0
A.A.	0	0	0
B.A.	0	67	67
M.A.	0	33	33
PH.D.	0	0	0
Teaching Experience (%)			
0-5 Years	0	29	29
6-10 Years	0	22	22
11-20 Years	0	19	19
21-40 Years	0	30	30
Certification (%)			
No Certificate	0	0	0
Permanent	0	100	100
Temporary	0	0	0

TEACHER PROFILE

Kleberg

Demographic Information

Category	Male	Female	Total
Number	1	8	9
Percent	11	89	100
Age		Percent	
26	0	34	34
26-35	0	33	33
36-45	11	0	11
46-55	0	22	22
56-65	0	0	0
-65	0	0	0
Race		Percent	
Anglo	11	67	78
Negro	0	22	22
Mexican-American	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0

Academic and Career Experience

Category	Male	Female	Total
Education Level (%)			
No Degree	0	0	0
A.A	0	0	0
B.A.	0	78	78
M.A.	11	11	22
PH.D.	0	0	0
Teaching Experience (%)			
0-5 Years	0	56	56
6-10 Years	0	11	11
11-20 Years	11	11	22
21-40 Years	0	11	11
Certification (%)			
No Certificate	0	0	0
Permanent	11	56	67
Temporary	0	33	33

TEACHER PROFILE

Thomas L. Marsalis

Demographic Information

Category	Male	Female	Total
Number	3	20	23
Percent	13	87	100
Age		Percent	
26	4	27	31
26-35	0	40	40
36-45	4	13	17
46-55	4	4	8
56-65	0	4	4
-65	0	0	0
Race		Percent	
Anglo	4	74	78
Negro	9	13	22
Mexican-American	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0

Academic and Career Experience

Category	Male	Female	Total
Education Level (%)			
No Degree	0	0	0
A.A	0	0	0
B.A.	9	70	79
M.A.	4	17	21
PH.D.	0	0	0
Teaching Experience (%)			
0-5 Years	4	44	48
6-10 Years	0	30	30
11-20 Years	9	9	18
21-40 Years	0	4	4
Certification (%)			
No Certificate	0	0	0
Permanent	13	78	91
Temporary	0	9	9

TEACHER PROFILE

Mark Twain

Demographic Information

Category	Male	Female	Total
Number	2	15	17
Percent	12	88	100
Age		Percent	
26	6	18	24
26-35	6	18	24
36-45	0	40	40
46-55	0	6	6
56-65	0	6	6
-65	0	0	0
Race		Percent	
Anglo	6	64	70
Negro	6	24	30
Mexican-American	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0

Academic and Career Experience

Category	Male	Female	Total
Educational Level (%)			
No Degree	0	0	0
A.A	0	0	0
B.A.	6	70	76
M.A.	6	18	24
PH.D.	0	0	0
Teaching Experience			
0-5 Years	12	29	41
6-10 Years	0	18	18
11-20 Years	0	35	35
21-40 Years	0	6	6
Certification (%)			
No Certificate	0	0	0
Permanent	6	70	76
Temporary	6	18	24

TEACHER PROFILE

Nancy Jane Cochran

Demographic Information

Category	Male	Female	Total
Number	1	18	19
Percent	5	95	100
Age		Percent	
26	0	5	5
26-35	0	48	48
36-45	5	21	26
46-55	0	5	5
56-65	0	16	16
-65	0	0	0
Race		Percent	
Anglo	5	69	74
Negro	0	26	26
Mexican-American	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0

Academic and Career Experience

Category	Male	Female	Total
Education Level (%)			
No Degree	0	0	0
A.A.	0	0	0
B.A.	0	69	69
M.A.	5	26	31
PH.D.	0	0	0
Teaching Experience (%)			
0-5 Years	0	26	26
6-10 Years	0	21	21
11-20 Years	5	37	42
21-40 Years	0	11	11
Certification (%)			
No Certificate	0	0	0
Permanent	5	90	95
Temporary	0	5	5

TEACHER PROFILE

WINNETKA

Category	Male	Female	Total
Number	3	14	17
Percent	16	82	100
Age		Percent	
26	6	12	18
26-35	6	28	34
36-45	0	12	12
46-55	6	12	18
56-65	0	18	18
-65	0	0	0
Race		Percent	
Anglo	12	58	70
Negro	6	24	30
Mexican-American	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0

Academic and Career Experience

Category	Male	Female	Total
Education Level (%)			
No Degree	0	0	0
A.A	0	0	0
B.A.	12	70	82
M.A.	6	12	18
PH.D.	0	0	0
Teaching Experience (%)			
0-5 Years	6	23	29
6-10 Years	6	23	29
11-20 Years	0	12	12
21-40 Years	6	24	30
Certification (%)			
No Certificate	0	0	0
Permanent	18	82	100
Temporary	0	0	0

The demographic data reveals the closeness of match-up with experimental and control schools. Seagoville, matched with Kleberg, showed an attendance ratio of only .007 greater than Kleberg. Their ethnic composition revealed that both schools were predominately Anglo. Their parental education level, housing evaluation, major zoning classification and socioeconomic status indicator were the same and neither school have apartments. The only difference in the matching is the average daily membership which reveals Seagoville a much larger school, but only the fourth grade was used at Seagoville and at Kleberg, the match-up on fourth grade size was somewhat closer.

Demographic data on the matching of Marsalis and Twain reveal average daily membership relatively the same and the attendance ratio difference of only .027. Both schools are predominately minority schools. Their parental education level, apartment rental (monthly), major zoning classification, and socioeconomic status indicator are the same. The housing valuation is higher in the Marsalis district than in the Twain district but the authors believed that this difference would have no effect on the practicum.

The demographic data matching Cochran and Winnetka showed that only in the housing valuation and apartment rental (monthly) were there any appreciable differences. Again, the authors believed this lack of comparability would not have any effect on the practicum.

The comparability of all of the experimental schools with their respective control schools on the socioeconomic status indicator seemed to point out that the negative attitudes on the part of students did cross socioeconomic status lines. This same interpretation seemed to appear in the contrasting of ethnic balances of the matched experimental

and control schools.

The teacher profile data revealed comparability of the three experimental schools with their respective control schools. The race-percent was set by the court in 1971 as 70 percent Anglo to 30 percent minority with a plus or minus five percent difference allowed. The teacher profiles' race-percent reveals this ratio set by the court.

The educational level of teachers is also comparable between the experimental and control schools. Seagoville (experimental) has 67 percent of its teachers with B.A. Degrees and 33 percent with M.A. degrees while Kleberg (control) has 78 percent of its teachers with B.A. degrees and 22 percent with M.A. degrees. Marsalis (experimental) and Twain (control) have only a three percent difference in teachers in each school holding B.A. degrees and M.A. degrees. There are, however, 13 percent more of the teachers at Cochran (experimental) holding M.A. degrees than hold these same degrees at Winnetka (control). No information of comparison concerning doctorial level degrees can be made since no teachers in either experimental or control schools hold such degrees. The district considers Ed.D. degrees the same as Ph.D. when publishing the teacher education level profiles.

The teacher profile data did reveal some differences in teaching experience of the teachers in the matched schools but the authors believed this would have little or no effect on the practicums.

Selection of Experimental and Control School Grade Levels

The authors selected the fourth-, fifth- and sixth-grade students in the practicum program because of the age level and maturity of the students. It was felt that since a secondary program was being adapted

to the elementary level, we needed to use the upper grade levels in the experimental schools. For comparability, naturally, the authors selected the corresponding grades in the control schools.

Seagoville (experimental) and Kleberg (control) are K-4 schools; therefore, the authors selected the fourth grade only in those schools. At Marsalis (experimental) and at Twain (control) the fourth, fifth and sixth grades were selected for the program and comparability. Using their respective fourth-, fifth-and sixth-grade students, the same selection process was used then for Cochran (experimental) and Winnetka (control).

Having thus matched experimental and control schools and selected the grade levels at which the program would be implemented, the groundwork was then laid for achieving one of the major objectives, namely, proper evaluation of the effects of the elementary LIFE Leadership Program once it had been implemented in the experimental schools at the specified grade levels.

Plans for implementing the elementary LIFE Leadership Program in the three experimental schools included receiving existing materials and making necessary revisions, establishing orientation sessions for control school and experimental school teachers and principals, scheduling training workshops for experimental school teachers, and determining the starting and finishing dates for the experimental program. January, 1975, was established for the actual implementation of the elementary LIFE Leadership Program.

Simultaneously with this laying of the groundwork for implementation of the program, the principals of the experimental schools were

concerning themselves with the development of the elementary LIFE Leadership Program itself, primarily with modification of the secondary LIFE Leadership Program which had already been implemented in DISD secondary schools.

Description of Secondary-level LIFE Leadership Program

What Is LIFE? Leaders Interested in the Future of Education (LIFE) is a leadership training program in the DISD aimed at gaining useful knowledge of people's individual differences and developing leadership skills to guide and make proper use of these differences in a meaningful and effectively functioning situation within the appropriate frame of educational values. LIFE Leadership is based on the premise that meaningful understanding and constructive changes in the secondary schools occur most frequently when administrators, teachers, parents, and students work together to assess need, plan improvements, commit themselves to implementing the new ideas, and continuously evaluate their work. As people become involved through an interchange of ideas in meaningful ways, "people support that which they help create" becomes the spirit of the organization. In this type of situation a leader can become effective. The leader is not limited to his or her own ideas nor those of an executive committee, but is able to draw upon the suggestions of the membership. Thus, decisions may be more sound and have more support after an evaluation of alternatives.

LIFE is a Leadership Process. LIFE is a leadership process incorporating techniques of involvement leading to better understanding of self and others and allowing for the development of a more comfortable learning climate. The objectives of the LIFE Leadership Program in

secondary schools were listed as follows:

1. Enhance student leadership through the establishment of mutually developed goals.
2. Develop conditions and opportunities for the improvement of interpersonal relations and improvement of the general climate for education in the secondary schools.
3. Upgrade the quality of student leadership responsibilities.
4. Coordinate local-building leadership areas having effect upon the climate within each school.

The following structural outline was developed to present succinctly an overview of the secondary LIFE Leadership Program:

What is it? What can it do?

LEADERS INVOLVED IN THE FUTURE OF EDUCATION

LEADERSHIP
TECHNIQUES

The STRATEGY is to employ participation, causing involvement through team activity.

The TOOL is the team of eight which incorporates techniques of involvement in a structured learning situation leading to better understanding of self and others, allowing effective problem-solving and decision-making.

LIFE Leadership helps people to better understand the idea of a "social system." Through team interaction participants are allowed to integrate views of self and others. Each person gains more insight into the interconnectedness of social, interpersonal, cultural, economic, historical, etc., factors.

APPRECIATION OF SELF AND OTHERS

PEER PRESSURE AND ITS EFFECTS

PROBLEM-SOLVING

OPEN AND HONEST COMMUNICATION

UNDERSTANDING ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS

DECISION-MAKING

INSIGHTS INTO THE PROBLEMS OF STRESS AMONG . . .

Student-Student

Student-Teacher

Teacher-Teacher

Teacher-Administration

Parent-School

(Source: Secondary LIFE Leadership Office in DISD)

The LIFE program had been implemented at the secondary level for the past four years. According to staff members involved in that implementation, they saw much greater involvement of students and especially teachers, as the area concept of leadership training was implemented. Under this philosophy, leadership teams from each high school faculty were formed and trained. These school teams were the catalysts necessary for greater total involvement. They planned, developed, and conducted area leadership labs with the technical assistance provided by the LIFE Leadership trainers.

These teams, which form one of the basic components of the secondary LIFE Leadership Program, are called the LIFE TAIM teams. TAIM is an acronym for "trainers applying involvement management." A LIFE TAIM team consists of administrators, students and teachers who will:

1. be willing to cooperate,
2. oversee the projected management of the LIFE program,
3. make the in-house contacts,
4. recruit and train others,
5. survey in-house climate needs and assist in the development and improvement methods for identified needs,
6. gather data on the effectiveness of their work, and
7. periodically report progress.

Selection of a team is the first step in the process of organizing an in-house leadership program on the secondary level. It is suggested that a selection of selected and non-elected student leaders be considered, such as those who are members of Human Relations Committee, Student

Advisory Committee, Student Council, and other student leadership peer action groups effecting the climate of the school.

It is recommended that the selection of students for the training lab be based upon recognition of innate leadership qualities. While it is important for team members to understand such tools of leadership as parliamentary procedures, span of control, delegation of authority, and committee structure, these are of little value to a prospective student leader who lacks judgment or analysis ability. Hopefully, the selected students would possess qualities that would enable them to take the skills and techniques of the process back to the local building to help train other student leaders within their school.

TAIM Team Functions. The members of an efficient and productive facilitator team must provide for meeting two kinds of needs: what it takes to do the job, and what it takes to strengthen and maintain the climate. Specifically, the team must be prepared to effect the following:

1. Initiating activity: organization of material and facilities.
2. Seeking information: asking for clarification of suggestions, requesting additional information or facts.
3. Coordinating: showing relationships among various ideas or suggestions, trying to pull ideas and suggestions together, trying to draw together activities of various subgroups and individual members.
4. Evaluating: submitting group decisions or accomplishments to comparison with group standards; measuring accomplishments against goals.

5. Diagnosing: determining sources of difficulties, appropriate steps to take next; analyzing the main blocks to progress.
6. Testing for Consensus: tentatively asking for group opinions in order to find out whether the group is nearing consensus on decision; sending up trial balloons to test group opinions.
7. Mediating: harmonizing, conciliating differences in points of view; making compromise solutions
8. Relieving tension: draining off negative feelings; putting a tense situation in wider context.

From time to time, people behave in nonfunctional ways that actually harm the group and the work it is trying to do. TAIM team members must be able to deal effectively with such behavior. Some of the more common types of such nonfunctional behaviors are described below.

1. Being aggressive: working for status by criticizing or blaming others; showing hostility, deflating the ego or status of others.
2. Blocking: interfering with the progress of the group by going off on a tangent; citing personal experiences unrelated to the problem; arguing too much on a point; rejecting ideas without consideration.
3. Self-confessing: using the group as a sounding board; expressing personal, nongroup-oriented feelings or points of view.

4. Competing: vying with others to produce the best idea; talking the most, playing the most roles; gaining favor with the leader.
5. Seeking sympathy: trying to induce members to be sympathetic to one's problems, or disparaging one's own ideas to gain support.
6. Special pleading: introducing or supporting suggestions related to one's own pet concerns or philosophies; lobbying.
7. Horsing around: clowning, joking, mimicking, disrupting the work of the group.
8. Seeking recognition: attempting to call attention to one's self by loud or excessive talking, extreme ideas, unusual behavior.
9. Withdrawal: acting indifferent; resorting to excessive doodling; whispering to others; wandering from the subject.

LIFE TAIM teams function in their schools throughout the school year through student council, homerooms, and classrooms. These TAIM teams are trainers for the second basic component of the LIFE Leadership Program: school-wide "interaction labs", or "mini" labs, held during September and October, 1971, in all high schools and junior high schools. The labs involved 70,000 students in the city. They were held in order to increase meaningful understanding between ethnic groups and promote school unity, and were conducted in compliance with the court-ordered desegregation plan.

A laboratory is defined as a setting for research, testing,

analysis, and experimental technical work. The secondary LIFE Leadership Program uses these techniques in selection of strategies for problem identification and solutions; thus, the term "LIFE Leadership Lab" is used in reference to group interaction sessions.

The "interaction labs" utilize groups of approximately eight students interacting and operating on the following levels:

1. Task level: Every group has some task confronting it, and most groups exist primarily for carrying out a task. A task consists of whatever it is that the group has been organized or designated to do. Most groups are primarily conscious of the task need and seem to operate mainly on that level.
2. Maintenance level: A group consists of a constantly changing network of interactions and relationships between persons. A group, therefore, has a growing awareness of itself as a group, and it is faced with the need to maintain the interactions and relationships within it in some genuine "working order" if the task is to be accomplished. This is the morale factor in groups.
3. Individual need - Meeting level: Every group is composed of individuals, each of whom brings to the group individual needs which impinge upon the group and its task. These needs range from the desire for comfortable chairs to the need to "show off." It is at this level that a group is most apt to be found wanting, for individual needs are

frequently screened behind the task drive of the group and/or well-developed behavior patterns. Many a group has floundered because the individual needs have remained beneath the surface.

The secondary LIFE Leadership Program developed and published a number of "interaction lab booklets" used with the students, teachers, and administrators during the school year as the basic component of their LIFE Leadership Program. Most of the lab booklets were designed for approximately two-hour lab sessions. The writers of this practicum adapted four of the secondary booklets to be used during implementation of the practicum with their elementary students, along with one booklet written especially for elementary students. (These adapted booklets for the "interaction labs" will be discussed in detail on pages 59-80 of this report.)

The titles of the secondary LIFE Leadership interaction lab booklets are as follows:

Unit One	Why I Carry My Books to School for Twelve Years
**Unit Two	Elementary Life - (available in English and Spanish)
Unit Three	Components of a System
*Unit Four	Citizenship and Youth
Unit Five	Participation Trends
*Unit Six	Pride and Responsibility (available in English and Spanish)
Unit Seven	Partnership: Self/Career

Unit Eight	What Happened
Unit Nine	Educational Trends
*Unit Ten	Expectations of Self and Others
Unit Eleven	Continuing Communications
*Unit Twelve	Do Something Beautiful
Unit Thirteen	Developing Ownership for New Students
Unit Fourteen	Building a Comfortable Learning Climate
Unit Fifteen	Usages of Appropriate Leadership Styles
Unit Sixteen	Creating Meaningful Changes
Unit Seventeen	Conflict Management Guidelines for Student Leaders
Unit Eighteen	Groping for Grouping
Unit Nineteen	Internal Relations
Unit Twenty	External Relations
Unit Twenty-One	Challenge toward Change (Five-hour lab)

*Portions of these booklets adapted for the practicum will be discussed in detail in the Sequence of Activities sections of this report.

**This booklet was used in its entirety in the practicum.

The regular "mini" labs were held weekly. In addition, Saturday follow-up labs were held monthly. Discussions with administrators and school board members, application of LIFE Leadership techniques, respect for law, and attitudes were some of the topics. Student and teacher teams helped the LIFE staff with the meetings in various geographical areas of the city.

Staff development labs are a third focal component of the secondary LIFE Leadership Program. These are a series of labs conducted in the schools during released time. With a full-time

administrative staff available, labs varying in time length from two hours to two days were developed for use by schools upon request, to aid in copying with unique individual problems. Recognizing, developing, and utilizing leadership abilities are approached through this medium. The staff was utilized by local schools to prevent mounting tensions, improve student-teacher relationships, and organize or develop more effective Student Councils.

Adaptation of the Secondary LIFE Leadership Program to the Elementary Level

The LIFE Leadership Program which existed in the secondary schools required several changes before implementation in the elementary schools. Primary changes involved simplifying the activities and reducing the emphasis on student leadership while simultaneously increasing the prominence of the teachers' role in the lab sessions.

Although group interaction and mutual problem-solving were retained as key ingredients in the elementary program, the age of the children precluded completely relinquishing the leadership roles of the teachers. While seventeen- and eighteen-year-old students can be given an assignment and allowed to arrive at solutions independently, elementary students need direction, questioning, and approval to encourage their participation.

The practicum authors were of the opinion that most of the concepts of the secondary LIFE porgram should be retained. These included concepts such as pride and responsibility, leadership, citizenship, expectations of self and others, and group involvement. However, selecting activities for elementary students, changes in vocabulary

and the scope of the concept had to be considered. For instance, in secondary lab sessions the concept of leadership could be discussed relative to an entire community or institution, such as a school system. In the elementary school the scope had to be reduced to an area with which the students could relate. This area might be confined to the school building or even the classroom. Vocabulary was particularly important and had to be on a level that corresponded to every ability level in the classroom; otherwise, teachers found that many students were not participating simply because they did not understand what was happening. Elementary school teachers were aware of this and took pains to insure that a proper vocabulary was used, while at the same time not "talk down" to any group. The TAIM team component of the secondary LIFE program was not adapted to the elementary program because of students' ages. The maturity level of the students and the time allotment for organizing the team was too long for implementation in the practicum.

Another change necessary for adapting the secondary LIFE program to the elementary level concerned teacher training. The secondary program involved training sessions which lasted for several days and included teachers and students selected at various schools. The teachers and students were selected on the basis of interest and leadership ability already demonstrated in past performances. The purpose of the training program was to provide necessary leadership in the LIFE program at the individual secondary schools. The training program for the elementary LIFE program did not include students because of their age as well as the problem of assembling in various parts of the city.

Teachers alone were given two training sessions of four hours each, however, in an effort to prepare them for the elementary program. (The details of this training procedure are discussed at length on pages 41-56 of this report.)

A third change was represented by the expanded role of the teacher at the elementary level. Secondary school students are capable of leading group discussions; group participation is easily obtained once students are relaxed and confident in their own input. At the elementary level the role of the teacher had to be more pronounced to insure participation by all students.

The preceding represents key changes the practicum authors made in the secondary LIFE program before implementation at the elementary level. (Other modifications and/or recommendations in the program are discussed on pages 100-101 of this report.)

PRE-PLANNING

The planned approach to improve student attitudes toward school teachers and administrators started on October 14, 1974, and ended on May 31, 1975. Under the direction and supervision of the three experimental school principals, co-authors of this report, a series of meetings and activities were carried out.

The first meeting was an orientation meeting of the three experimental school principals. They discussed a plan of action for improving student attitudes toward school, teachers, and principals. Various abstracts secured from Region X Education Center, ERIC file, informed the discussion. Among them were:

ED 079 326

Author	Gable, Robert K; Roberts, Authur D.
Title	The Development of an Instrument to Measure Attitudes Toward School Subjects
Date	1972

ED 073 392

Author	Ferinden, William E., Jr.
Title	Classroom Management Through the Application of Behavior Modification Techniques
Date	1970

ED 070 210

Author	McKeen, Cliff; and Others
Title	Peer Interaction Rate, Classroom Activity and Teaching Style
Date	July, 1972

Present literature concerning student attitudes were also discussed including the following:

Title	Studying the School in the Classroom
Author	Mackey, James A.
Source	Social Studies, V63 n7 pp. 317-321
Date	December, 1972
Title	Effects of Co-operation and Competition on Pupil Learning
Author	Thompson, G. Brian
Source	Educational Research, V15 n1 pp. 28-36
Date	November, 1972

Finally, desired outcomes were discussed and conclusions drawn with regard to questions raised by the discussion. The questions included:

1. What programs have been successful in changing student attitudes?

2. What attitudes are we trying to change?

3. How do we determine if attitudes have changed?

4. What kind of support can we expect from DISD and the teaching staff?

5. What materials, programs, and so on do we have in DISD that will aid in establishing such a program?

Conclusions drawn in answer to these questions were:

1. Successful programs to change student attitudes involved much student participation.

2. The authors agreed that we need to develop positive attitudes toward school and the learning environment.

3. Less incidents of negative student behavior would indicate attitude changes.

4. The authors felt that their district and their respective teachers would support positive approaches to change attitudes or behavior of students.

5. The authors had heard of the secondary-level LIFE Leadership Program.

A brainstorming session was held which resulted in isolating the following as desired outcomes of the projected elementary program:

1. Better teacher-student relationships

2. Better administration-student relationships

3. Better student-student relationships

4. Increased student responsibility

At this same session it was decided to investigate and gather infor-

mation concerning the LIFE Leadership Program currently operating on the Senior High level in the DISD.

A second planning meeting was held on October 30, 1974, with Tulla Bussell, coordinator for the District LIFE Leadership Program. An explanation of the current DISD program was given by Mrs. Bussell. She seemed very receptive and interested in questions concerning the LIFE Leadership Program. At this meeting it was decided that the LIFE Leadership Program then existing in the DISD was the type of program that would meet the needs of the three experimental schools. Mrs. Bussell advised that the District was in the process of rewriting several LIFE programs on the elementary level, thus further encouraging the development of the practicum. This was a very enlightening meeting and all parties represented were excited about the possibility of starting a pilot LIFE Leadership Program in the three experimental elementary schools.

On November 8, 1974, a third planning meeting was held by the experimental school principals. Following the recommendation of Mrs. Bussell, it was decided that a minimum of two hours a week would be devoted to the elementary LIFE Leadership Program during the regular social studies period. Because of teacher training, teacher orientation, the printing of materials, orientation of control schools, and orientation of students which program implementation would require, it was acknowledged that January would probably be the earliest date the authors could expect to start the practicum.

A fourth planning meeting was held on November 12, 1974. Those in attendance included the experimental and control school principals:

1. Frank Putenny, Principal of Mark Twain Elementary, the control school for T. L. Marsalis Elementary, Earl Beesley, Principal

2. Jack Martin, Principal of Kleberg Elementary, the control school for Seagoville Elementary, George Simms, Principal.
3. Jack London, Principal of Winnetka, the control school for Nancy J. Cochran, Marcus Gifford, Principal.

The control school principals were given an orientation description of the projected program by the experimental school principals. Desired outcomes, based on the goals of the elementary LIFE program, were discussed. The pretesting day which would inaugerate implementation of the program for both the experimental and control schools was scheduled for the day following the experimental schools' teacher training workshop. The day was January 8, 1976.

Selection and Administration of Evaluation Instrument

On November 27, 1974, a meeting was held by the participating principals for the purpose of selecting a pre- and posttest instrument. The final test was a composite developed from a number of tests made available to the authors by Region X Education Center. (See Appendix A).

The following procedure was developed for administering the pre- and posttests:

1. The tests would be delivered and picked up by experimental school principals.
2. Tests would be administered by experimental and control school teachers.
3. Tests would be graded under the direction of the experimental school principals.

Teacher Training Workshops

A planning meeting was held on December 9, 1974, for experimental school teachers. They were given an orientation description of the elementary LIFE Leadership Program by the experimental school principals. The teachers were very interested in the LIFE program, but were somewhat apprehensive concerning their ability to implement it. Their anxiety was somewhat suppressed when a full explanation of the program was given and when they learned about the large amount of support, training, and materials which would be forthcoming.

The teachers agreed that the ideal time for their training workshop would be during the first semester break. The workshops were thus scheduled:

1. January 6, 1975 (1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.) at T. L. Marsalis Elementary School.
2. January 7, 1975 (1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.) at the DISD Administration Building.

First Workshop Day. On January 6, 1975, at 1:00 p.m., the fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade social studies teachers of the three experimental schools were provided a workshop by Mrs. Bussell, LIFE Leadership Coordinator for the DISD. This workshop lasted approximately four hours. Mrs. Bussell oriented the teachers as to what would be covered in the workshops. The teachers were then grouped for a warm-up activity. This activity was an experiment in cooperation. It consisted of an instruction sheet and five envelopes containing fifteen pieces of tagboard for forming squares (see Appendix B). This activity was designed to show the importance of group cooperation in a non-verbal way.

The second activity consisted of a review of classroom climate

(see Appendix C). Each teacher and principal was given a copy of a training packet. This packet explored a conceptual framework for a productive instructional climate, introducing skills necessary for individualized student grouping, effective techniques for modification of student behavior, modification of the classroom climate, and modification of teacher behavior. This second activity was designed to promote several outcomes:

> Each participant will gain an understanding of the laboratory instructional philsophy and the skills necessary to implement that philosophy in the classroom, thus changing the perception he has of himself as a teacher and the role of the participant as learner.
>
> Each participant will become familiar with and be able to use the skill of individualizing through the group process.
>
> Each participant will become familiar with and be able to use the skill of sending congruent communication messages to his own pupils, and training students in sending congruent communication messages to the teacher or class members.
>
> Each participant will become familiar with and be able to use the skills of laboratory resolution. (Source: Secondary LIFE Leadership Booklet, Classroom Climate).

According to Mrs. Bussell's introduction to the activity, teachers of the future may be subject-matter specialists, but they also must be able to demonstrate the managerial skills necessary to build productive and satisfying learning groups. It must be recognized that classroom groups consist of patterns of behavior. The idea of a productive classroom climate, which for so long has been only an abstraction, can be made concrete only by the use of appropriate management practices. Teachers not only are confronted with individual needs and problems, but are faced, as well, with a complex human network--the behavior in the organizational setting of the classroom, understanding of the

social-psychology of the classroom organization, and insights into facilitative and maintenance practices.

In addition to knowing how to organize subject matter and to build the most effective classroom organization that is possible. Effective management can be learned and must be developed by practice for developing and maintaining a productive instructional climate. The activity/packet presented by Mrs. Bussell was of the packet itself were defined as follows:

Objective number one: Increase the effectiveness of teacher and pupil communication, skills, and techniques as demonstrated by

a. increased attempts to clarify the intent of classroom messages
b. increased use of responses appropriate for individual messages
c. increased attempts to identify feeling underlying messages
d. reduction of negative and increase of positive ripple effects on classroom group
e. reduction of number and frequency of communications stumbling blocks
f. increased attempts to identify pupils' problems

Objective number two: Describe grouping procedures based on ability, interest, and life style of pupils and develop tutoring groups based on these procedures in the classroom.

Objective number three: Develop and implement procedures for improving and maintaining the activity flow in the classroom which shows evidence of

a. classroom group involvement in the establishment of rules and policies
b. reduced conflicts occurring in the classroom
c. increased acceptance of responsibility by pupils for management, scheduling, evaluation of group productivity
d. increased interest in classroom activities

The activities in which the teachers actually participated in the workshops concerning the first classroom climate objective defined above are found in the Classroom Climate Booklet in Appendix C. In the workshop the teachers went through the three exercises on pages ten, eleven, and twelve of that booklet in response to objective 1 a. The exercises were to help teachers clarify the intent of the classroom messages communicated from teacher to student. For example, the participants discussed the plain question, "What are you doing?" That question might become a sarcastic "What are you doing?," or a shocked "What are you doing?," or perhaps a belittling "What are you doing?," depending upon the way it is asked.

Many times our different "language worlds" can cause classroom climate to deteriorate. Workshop participants were asked to jot down the three most frequently used responses or expressions that they employed in their classrooms. These were discussed in such a way that the teachers could see that effective responses demand practice.

It was also explained to the participants that teachers respond to students by means other than spoken words; for example, by facial and body expressions, nearness to or touching of a student, and social and individual activities, as well as by employment of such material things as food, playthings, and rewards. The teachers were encouraged to ask their own students to show them the most frequent responses that they use. Most of the teachers agreed that they were not really aware of some of their responses.

In response to Objective 1 b concerning individual messages, the participants were led by Mrs. Bussell through an exercise to promote realization that some messages sent by the teachers could be "faulty." An example cited was that many times a "you" message could eliminate

undershooting, blaming, judging, sarcasm, and soon simply by being changed to an "I" message. Page twelve, Appendix C, was covered in more detail to illustrate faulty message sending.

Objective 1 c took the participants through a session of thinking about the feelings of students who utter some expression either to the teacher or overheard by the teacher. Participants discussed and tried to identify some hidden feelings behind words expressed in their classrooms. Some examples given in the discussion are found on page 13 of Appendix C. This entire exercise was designed to make the participants more aware of those feelings that could make a climatic difference in their classrooms.

The use of "praise" in the classroom (Objective 1 d) was then discussed. Do we praise enough? Do we praise too much? What words or expressions are appropriate for positive reinforcement to students? This example exercise is found on pages 14 - 17 of Appendix C. All of the participants agreed that they should strive to "accentuate the positive" and try to "eliminate the negatives" in their classrooms. Such an attitude on the part of teachers could also help stop those "ripple effects" in the classroom which are discussed on page 17 of Appendix C.

Mrs. Bussell related that many times teachers create "stumbling blocks" for students and that students in turn create them for each other. "Stumbling blocks" are things such as directing, ordering, warning, advising, kidding, sarcasm, and so on. (Page 18 of Appendix C lists more.) Such "stumbling blocks" many times cut off effective communications, making a child feel that a teacher is not interested

and shows lack of respect. Since responses such as these often stem from hostility in an adult, they consequently may provoke counter-hostility on the part of students.

The last portion of Objective One dealt with trying to teach the participants to correctly identify problems that a student might be having. Mrs. Bussell defined this as a tricky skill to master. Quite often, she related, teachers attempt to identify a problem from a feeling or a response made by a student. Teachers should thus ask themselves questions such as:

1. Do the students do most of the talking?
2. Are we as teachers talking or telling?
3. Do we listen for cues?
4. Do we basically use the same line of questioning with each child?
5. Do we follow through to check to see if our problem identification was correct?

To sum up Objective One (to increase effectiveness of teacher and pupil communication skills), Mrs. Bussell asked the participants to complete a chart (see page 20, Appendix C) concerning, "As it was" and "As it is now." This chart was to be used throughout the elementary LIFE Leadership Program to help meet the objectives of "effective classroom climate."

To cover Objective Number Two, workshop participants received an explanation from Mrs. Bussell concerning "Grouping," a major part of the laboratory techniques used in the LIFE Leadership Program. Six to eight members were established as the most appropriate size for the groups. "Tutoring Grouping" was also explained as different from

tutoring a group. "Tutoring Grouping" involves all students. Each becomes a tutor by some means in a tutoring grouping situation. Three successful components of "Tutoring Grouping" were defined as ability, interest, and life-style combination.

Next, Mrs. Bussell discussed the different life-styles of students and how the effective teacher should try to balance each student's needs and abilities with the needs and abilities of others in the group. It was brought out that most people have a combination of life-styles. A listing, definition, and examples of different life-styles that the participants would be working with in the LIFE Program is found on pages 25 - 27 in Appendix C.

Again, as in Objective Number One, the participants were asked to complete the chart on page 31, Appendix C, concerning "As it was" and "As it is now." This was a summing-up exercise after going through grouping procedures, individualizing, and tutoring grouping.

The last objective covered during the first day of the Teacher Training Workshop was to develop and implement procedures for improving and maintaining the active flow in the classroom. This objective, as discussed by Mrs. Bussell, was to involve the classroom of students in group establishment of classroom rules and procedures. The discussion was geared to the best procedures teachers might use to improve the climate of the classroom by reducing conflicts occurring in the classroom, by increasing acceptance of responsibilities by students as to management scheduling and evaluation of group productivity, and by increasing student interest in classroom activities. (An explanation of the workshop discussion on classroom climate is found on pages 36 - 36 of Appendix C.)

The two main ideas brought out in the discussion of Objective Number Three were (a) that a teacher must involve the students in each classroom in the making of the rules and procedures, and (b) that a teacher must remember that it is his/her classroom that he/she is the manager who calls the shots, and that it is up to the teacher to develop the instructional climate.

Mrs. Bussell concluded the first day of the training program with a quick review of the need for communication skills, proper grouping techniques, and how to improve classroom climates. In closing, she referred again to a prominent theme of the LIFE Leadership Program—"People support that which they help create."

Second Workshop Day. The second day of the Teacher Training Workshop was held January 7, 1975 from 1:00 - 5:00 p.m. This workshop involved the introduction of the actual LIFE Leadership Labs. During this meeting, Mrs. Bussell guided the teachers and the experimental school principals through an actual LIFE Leadership lab book as if they were students. Mrs. Bussell stated that the objectives of this lab included:

1. Formulation of a positive and realistic opinion of self-worth
2. Developing an awareness of the need for being responsible for the consequences of personal actions
3. Identifying causes of existing characteristics of relevant, realistic, effective, and positive relationships within the school family

(Elementary LIFE Leadership - Appendix D)

After identifying and discussing the objectives of this lab, Mrs.

Bussell divided the participants into three groups, arranging the furniture to meet the needs of the grouping. Each group then started on the first activity, called "Password Game," which was designed to get participants better acquainted with one another. Each person, individually gave his full name and school. Then he carefully said one word related to his hobby. The group attempted to guess that person's favorite hobby. This activity was continued until each participant's hobby was identified.

After completion of the first activity, each group then discussed, "How we do things with others is important." Life is a story about people small, big, sad, and happy. Participants observed that people work, play, and share their lives with others, and that how we do things with each other is important. Each participant then passed out numbers, provided by Mrs. Bussell, to themselves and to others. If a participant had concern for self, then he gave himself a 9. If his concern for self was low, then he gave himself a 1. If participants had concern for others, then they gave others a 9. If their concern for others was low, then they gave others a 1. Mrs. Bussell explained to the participants that if they gave a 9 to themselves and also a 9 to others, a 9 - 9 climate would exist. We were told that each of us was more likely to constructively share ideas and responsibilities in a 9 - 9 climate. Each group then discussed the following statements and identified the statements as being 9 or 1.

1. John said, "I won't worry about Sally. She can take care of herself. She wouldn't like me anyway."

John gave himself a 9 or 1

John gave Sally a 9 or 1

2. Sally said, "I'll share ideas with the rest of the family and get them to do the same, listen to all of the suggestions, work together to plan a vacation."

Sally gave herself a 9 or 1

Sally gave her family a 9 or 1

3. Gene said, "I'll do whatever I want to on the team; it doesn't matter what George thinks."

Gene gave himself a 9 or 1

Gene gave George a 9 or 1

4. Sam said, "I'll get off the football team if you want me to, Carl."

Sam gave himself a 9 or 1

Sam gave Carl a 9 or 1

5. Tim said, "I really need help, but I am not going to ask my teacher to give it to me."

Tim gave himself a 9 or 1

Tim gave the teacher a 9 or 1

The second phase of the workshop was concerned with saying what we mean. Each group or team was given six sentences. One participant of the group repeated the first sentence four times by accenting the word "you." The second time the participant accented the word "really" and so on.

First person: <u>YOU</u> really send me

You <u>REALLY</u> send me

You really <u>SEND</u> me

You really send <u>ME</u>

A second participant then said, "I cannot do that."

Second person: I cannot do that

I CANNOT do that

I cannot DO that

I cannot DO that

I cannot do THAT

Third person: She is nice, but

Fourth person: He is my math teacher

Fifth person: My parents are here

Sixth person: Laws are for you and me

Mrs. Bussell explained to the participants that how they say things may not aways be what they really mean to say. The participants were told that if they listened to how they said things to other people, they might want to make a few changes.

Each group then read a story: "Pete."

Pete is in the seventh grade. He has gone to the same school all of his life and has many friends who started in the first grade with him. Pete and his friends really enjoy school. There is a strong school spirit. Everybody shares the different school duties, such as clean-up committees, safety patrol, and project planning. The principal and teachers have been real friends with the students.

One day a new student enrolls in the seventh grade. This student is a very nice-looking boy. He has moved into the community from another state. His

family has lived in many states, and he has gone to many different schools. His name is Sam.

Sam has never really had a chance to make or have real friends, because he has moved around so much. Sam wants to have friends in his new school. He begins to talk to different students. He seems to really like Pete.

Pete becomes interested in Sam and what he has to tell about the other places in which he has lived. One day Sam tells Pete that he is starting a club. Pete is to be the first member. Sam will tell him who the other members will be in a few days.

One of the club rules is that all members must not speak or play with any other person who is not a member. Another rule is not to tell anyone about the club.

Each group then discussed the question, "What should Pete do?"

1. Join the club and follow Sam's rules.
2. Tell Sam he does not want to be in the club.
3. Tell the principal that a secret club is starting.
4. Explain to Sam that a club is not needed to have friends.
5. Ask his/her parents about joining the club.
6. Tell his friends about the club and start his own club, leaving Sam out.

The purpose of these questions, explained Mrs. Bussell, was for the group to aid Pete in making the correct decision. After discussing the questions, each team answered the following true-false statements. Each group was to discuss the reason behind their answers.

1. Good manners are not necessary at school.
2. You need money to have good manners.
3. You do not need an education to have manners.
4. Good manners should be practiced at all times, whether someone is watching or not.
5. You should have good manners toward teachers, but not toward students in your school.
6. We have good manners at our school in the:

   classroom

   halls

   lunchrooms

After a short break, Mrs. Bussell directed the participants back into their respective groups to determine how many words each group could find by using the letters in the word, "responsibility." The group could use the letters as many times as they needed them. There was an experimental school principal in each of the three groups and, after discussion of the many words derived from the word "responsibility," each group discussed their principal's responsibilities in their school and wrote them down in the space provided in the lab book.

Discuss what you think some of your principal's responsibilities are in your school. Write them below:

1.	6.
2.	7.
3.	8.
4.	9.
5.	10.

Each group then discussed how they (as students) could help their principal with some of those responsibilities. Each group made two lists.

Responsibilities I can help with:	How I can help:
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.

Mrs. Bussell then directed each group to discuss (as students) their teachers' responsibilities. Each group listed those responsibilities:

1.	4.
2.	5.
3.	6.

Each group then discussed:

Is getting along with each other a responsibility in the classroom?

Yes_____ No_____

Each group, after answering their question positively, listed ways in which they (as students) could help their teacher with the

responsibility of getting along with each other in class:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

The closing session of this lab book consisted of group interaction and group discussion to answer six questions by circling Good or Poor.

1.	Our halls are clean.	Poor	Good
2.	We are friendly to each other in our school, not just our friends.	Poor	Good
3.	Students respect the teachers.	Poor	Good
4.	Students respect the principal.	Poor	Good
5.	Teachers respect and are kind to each other.	Poor	Good
6.	Learning is enjoyed by the students at our school.	Poor	Good

Mrs. Bussell then asked the groups if they (as students) should be concerned with the above questions. If so, stated Mrs. Bussell, what and how should they (as students) work with these subjects to get along better together. Each group was asked to list the ways that they could help:

1. In the classroom with the teacher:_____
   a._____
   b._____
   c._____

2. In the classroom with other students:_____

   a._____

   b._____

   c._____

3. In the halls with other students:_____

   a._____

   b._____

   c._____

4. In the lunchroom with other students:_____

   a._____

   b._____

   c._____

The last twenty minutes of the second-day workshop were devoted to an explanation of the pretest instrument and administrative procedures by the experimental school principals.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRACTICUM

Pretesting and Introduction

The elementary LIFE Leadership Program was implemented on January 8, 1975, with the administering of the pretest in the experimental and control schools. The pretesting portion went smoothly.

During the first session the experimental school teachers of the elementary LIFE Leadership Program explained the program to the students. They discussed the students' role in the program. The role of the students, as explained by the teachers, was to improve the self-others relationship through experience-based involvement opportunities. Students were told that they would be provided opportunities to share with each other through information-gathering, fact-finding, solution development, and decision-making. This would be done in group-interaction labs

within their social studies time in the classroom. The teachers explained grouping procedures and their importance in the program, stressing that working together in small groups would allow them the opportunities to:

1. Know each other better
2. Realize that how we do things with others is important
3. Establish the idea that "Everybody is Somebody"
4. Realize that how we say things may not really communicate what we mean to say
5. Realize how their roles affect the roles of their teachers, their principals, and the combined goal of improvement of the entire education climate within the school

Implementing the LIFE Leadership Program in the Classrooms

In the first session with their fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students after the pretest had been administered, the experimental school teachers discussed with them the word "LIFE" and what it stood for: Leaders Interested In the Future of Education. The program was described as a student-relations program designed to increase student insight through student-student, student-teacher, student-principal, and parent-school relations for the purpose of developing a better understanding of people's working together through open communication. The strategy, as explained, was to employ participation on the part of all the students through involvement in team activity. The group or team activity concept was then explained to the students along with the theme of the LIFE Program, namely, that "People support that which they help create." The tool of the LIFE Program was explained to

the teams or groups of approximately eight students who try to use team efforts were defined as the program tool which would lead to a better understanding of self and others, allowing effective problem-solving and decision-making.

After that orientation, the teachers numbered name tags to form groups. Students with #1 tags formed a team, #2 tags another team, and so on. Each of the groups then elected a recorder as a link between the individual and the group as well as between each group with the full class during shared discussions. After the students were arranged in their groups, the teachers gave them a puzzle warm-up activity. This activity was designed to get the group to cooperate as a team while attempting to solve a puzzle. The puzzle consisted of several pieces of tagboard cut into various shapes, and the idea was to form squares from the tagboard pieces in a non-verbal way. The instructions were as follows:

> Each team should have five envelopes containing 15 pieces for forming squares. Separate the pieces into ABCD stacks. Four members of the group will select a stack of pieces. The remaining group members will cooperate with their team members without working directly with the pieces being used. At the signal, the task of the team is to form five squares of various sizes. The task is not completed until everyone (team) has before them (team) five perfect squares.
>
> These are the rules:
>
> No Member of the Group May Speak
> No Member of the Group May Ask for a Card or in Any Way Signal That He Wants One
> Members of the Group May Give Cards to Others

After the activity, students were asked to respond to the following four true-false statements:

1. You wished to speak when someone held a piece and did not see the solution.
2. You were tense to the point of making motions when you saw someone finish his square and then sit back without seeing whether his solution prevented others from solving the problems.
3. The rules were not broken in any way.
4. You were patient with the person who was slow at seeing the solution.

The teachers concluded the warm-up activity by discussing with their students the following paragraph:

> Team learning is a powerful learning device that is often neglected because many students know cooperation only as cheating. JOINT PROBLEM SOLVING requires legitimate giving and receiving of help. A class of this kind is helpful if the members of the team become more sensitive to how their behavior may help or hinder JOINT PROBLEM SOLVING.

At the beginning of the second student lab session, the experimental-school teachers passed out to their students the first lab booklet entitled Elementary Life Leadership (see Appendix D). The teachers and students discussed the objectives of the booklet. Those objectives were printed on page one of the booklet, but they were also written on a corner of the chalkboard where they could be seen and referred to throughout the sessions concerning the first booklet. The objectives were listed as follows:

1. Formulating a positive and realistic image of self-worth
2. Developing an awareness of the need for being responsible for the consequences of personal actions.

3. Identifying causes of existing characteristics of relevant, realistic, effective, and positive relationships within the school family.

After the explanation of the booklet and its objectives, the groups were ready for their first lab booklet activity. This activity was designed to better acquaint students with their own group members. It was called, "Password Game." Each student, one at a time, gave his/her full name. Then he/she carefully said only one word which related to a favorite sport, pastime, or hobby. The person on the right would try to guess that favorite occupation. If the person missed, one more descriptive word was given and the second person on the right tried to guess. This continued around the group until the correct answer was guessed. Whoever guessed correctly then gave his/her full name and one word describing his favorite pastime, sport, or hobby. This process continued until each group member's full name and favorite occupation had been revealed. This activity concluded the first session of implementation of the LIFE Leadership Program of this practicum in the three experimental schools.

The third student lab session of the LIFE Program began with the experimental-school teachers explaining to the students that "Life" is a story about people. These are little people, middle-sized people, big people, old and young people, and sad and happy people. It was explained that all people are seen as living together, working together, playing together, and sharing with each other. It was emphasized that how we do things with others is important.

The students were then given some cards with the number "9" on them and some cards with the number "1" on them. Each explained that if a person had concern for self, then that person gave himself a "9." If a student had concern for another, then he would give a "9" to the other person. If his concern for others were low, then he would give himself a "1." The teachers then went on to explain that when one student gave a "9" to himself and a "9" to another, a 9 - 9 climate would exist. This 9 - 9 climate facilitated a more constructive sharing of ideas and responsibilities. Finally, the teachers explained that this 9 - 9 climate was based on the "Everybody Is Somebody" concept, a concept very much needed among the students within our schools.

Students were then asked to think about a member of their respective group and decide whether they would give him a "9" or a "1" in reference to some behavior that student had recently displayed. This thinking exercise lasted for only a couple of minutes and ended the session for that day.

In the fourth student lab session students moved into their respective group arrangements. The cards numbered with "9" and "1" were passed out to each student. The teachers then gave to the groups five examples each of which each student would label with a "9" or "1." The five examples were:

1. John said, "I won't worry about Sally. She can take care of herself. She wouldn't like me anymore."

   John gave himself a 9 or 1

   John gave Sally a 9 or 1

2. Sally said, "I'll share ideas with the rest of the family and get them to do the same, listen to all of the suggestions, work together to plan a vacation."

   Sally gave herself a 9 or 1

   Sally gave her family a 9 or 1

3. Gene said, "I'll do whatever I want to on the team, it doesn't matter what George thinks."

   Gene gave himself a 9 or 1

   Gene gave George a 9 or 1

4. Sam said, "I'll get off the football team if you want me to, Carl."

   Sam gave himself a 9 or 1

   Sam gave Carl a 9 or 1

5. Tim said, "I really need help, but I am not going to ask my teacher to give it to me."

   Tim gave himself a 9 or 1

   Tim gave the teacher a 9 or 1

After each individual student decided which numbers would be assigned, there was a group discussion to see if the members could agree as to which numbers were correctly given in each of the five examples. The consensus of each group was that the second example (Sally's statement, "I'll share ideas with the rest of the family and get them to do the same, listen to all of the suggestions, work together to plan a vacation") was the only example of the 9 - 9 concept.

In the next student lab session with the students, again in their respective groups, the experimental school teachers explained that how we say things and the emphasis we put on different words makes a

difference in what we are trying to communicate to others. In this activity one person of the group repeated the sentence, "You really send me," four times. The first time the sentence was repeated the student accented the word You. The second time, the word really was accented. The third time, the word send and the fourth time, the word me were accented.

A second student in the group did the same with the sentence, "I cannot do that." A third student took the sentence, "She is nice, but"; a fourth student, "He is my math teacher", a fifth student, "My parents are here"; a sixth student, "Laws are for you and me."

The teacher then discussed with the students the idea that how things are said may not always be what is really meant. It was suggested that each student should listen to how he said things to other people, and that everyone -- teachers as well as students -- might need to watch how certain words were emphasized in speech.

Next, each student was given a copy of the following story concerning Pete:

> Pete is in the seventh grade. He has gone to the same school all of his life and has many friends who started in the first grade with him. Pete and his friends really enjoy their school. There is a strong school spirit. Everybody shares the different school duties, such as clean-up committees, safety patrol, and project planning. The principal and teachers have been real friends with the students.
>
> One day a new student enrolls in the seventh grade. This student is a very nice-looking boy. He has moved into the

community from another state. His family has lived in many states, and he has gone to many different schools. His name is Sam. Sam has never really had a chance to make or have real friends because he has moved around so much. Sam wants to have friends in his new school. He begins to talk to different students. He seems to really like Pete.

Pete becomes interested in Sam and what he has to tell about the other places in which he has lived. One day Sam tells Pete that he is starting a club. Pete is to be the first member. Sam will tell him who the other members will be in a few days.

One of the club rules is that all members must not speak or play with any other person who is not a member. Another rule is to not tell anyone about the club.

After reading the story, the student groups then discussed questions as to what Pete should do. Should he join the club and follow Sam's rules? Should he tell Sam he does not want to join the club? Should he tell the principal that a secret club is starting? Should he try to explain to Sam that a club is not needed to have friends? Should Pete ask his parents about joining? Should he tell his friends about the club and start his own club, leaving Sam out? The purpose of this activity was to encourage student groups to participate in decision-making as individuals, then as a group to arrive at a consensus as to the right decisions that should be made in a simulated real life situation.

In the sixth LIFE lab session the groups were asked to respond as a team to the following true-false statements:

1. Good manners are not necessary at school.
2. You need money to have good manners.
3. You do not need an education to have manners.
4. Good manners should be practiced at all times, whether someone is watching or not.
5. You should have good manners toward teachers, but not toward students in your school.
6. We have good manners at our school in the:

   classroom

   halls

   lunchrooms

The students were also asked to discuss the reasons for their answers. Their answers were then shared with the other groups.

After concluding the true-false questions and discussions, each group was asked by the teacher to see how many words they could list using the letters in the word RESPONSIBILITY. The letters could be used as often as necessary. Results were shared with the class and each group was to tabulate a class list of words compiled from the individual groups. This strategy was to emphasize the importance of the RESPONSIBILITY each student has for making school life easier and more beneficial to all concerned.

During the next LIFE lab session the students were asked, within the groups, to think about some of their principal's responsibilities in their school and then to write them down. The teachers then asked the students which responsibilities they, as students, could share

with the principal. This same activity was then repeated using their teachers' responsibilities.

After concluding this portion of the lab session, the experimental principals made arrangements for a short visit with each of their respective classes over the next few days in order that the students might have an opportunity to ask questions concerning the various responsibilities principals have. These visits were expected to bring about better student understanding of their principals, thus improving the student-principal relationship.

In the last student lab session, using the Elementary Life Leadership Booklet, the teachers again asked their students to join their groups in order to discuss the following statements and use them as a guide in arriving at a group consensus as to whether they ranked conditions in their school as poor or good.

1. Our halls are clean.
2. We are friendly to each other in our school, not just to our friends.
3. Students respect the teachers.
4. Students respect the principal.
5. Teachers respect and are kind to each other.
6. Learning is enjoyed by the students at our school.

The teachers then posed the question, "Should students be concerned with these statements?" Unanimous "Yes" answers prompted the teachers to then ask the groups to list how students should work with the statements and subjects to get along better together. They discussed these subjects in reaction to the following areas:

1. In the classroom with the teacher.
2. In the classroom with other students.
3. In the halls with other students.
4. In the lunchroom with other students.

A list was made in each group and handed to the teacher. The experimental teachers then tabulated the student responses, duplicated them, and passed them back to the students the next day for each to have a copy to retain.

Following the completion of the first lab booklet, the authors of this practicum met in an evaluation conference to discuss how well the implementation of the first LIFE Lab Booklet had been carried out in their respective schools. It was believed expected outcomes were being attained and that the various secondary LIFE Booklets which had been chosen could be implemented in the following week.

In the ninth session of the "interaction labs," students of the experimental schools were introduced to the lab booklet entitled Pride and Responsibility. The objectives of the lab that were discussed with the students were:

1. To recognize a need for school pride.
2. To identify need areas and develop a plan of action for building better school pride.

The students then tried with the help of the teachers, to define the word "pride." More examples of pride were discussed in the tenth session. Various illustrations were cited by the teachers: the tailor who stitches the cuff of the pants as carefully as the collar of the coat; the mechanic who greases all of a car's points,

even though the owner won't notice it; the actor who works as hard on a minor part as on a leading role; the sales person who has just as much patience with a youngster buying a watch band as with a couple buying a tape recorder: and the typist who prepares each letter as carefully as if it were going to be signed by the president of the company.

After such examples, students were asked if the principal, the teachers, and individual students had pride in their schools. During the interaction lab which followed, students discussed as a team the different ways that students could exemplify pride in their school. Students produced such ideas as keeping the halls and classrooms clean of paper, keeping the school grounds clean of paper and debris, keeping the restrooms clean and not letting other students write on the walls, having clean-up periods when the desks would be cleaned, and having volunteers table monitors in the lunchrooms to see that tables were left clean for the next lunch period. The discussion groups also offered suggestions about how to demonstrate school pride through interaction with other students; for example, trying to help fellow students out, greeting new students with friendly faces and striving to make them feel welcome, and so on.

In the eleventh LIFE lab session student groups were asked to see how many words they could list using the letters from the words "pride" and "responsibility." This exercise in keeping with the theme "Pride and Responsibility," was to keep these two words on their minds and also to continue the team concept in solving problems. A small piece of candy was given to each of the team members listing the most words.

After this activity of listing words, the teams were asked to discuss whether responsibility could be shared with another, or whether it was an individual thing. All of the teams arrived at the conclusion that responsibility is both individual and shared.

In the twelfth session of lab activities the students and teachers discussed a hypothetical case involving a student called Bill. Bill saw a couple of other students writing on the outside bricks of the school when he arrived at school. As he entered the door, he observed some students letting water from the water fountain run on the floor. He also observed other students making loud noises and, on down the hall, some other students scuffling and calling each other names. Entering the classroom, he was surprised to see a student taking something from the teacher's desk and putting it in his pocket. During the lunch period, Bill observed several trays and items of food left on the tables. In the hallways, he observed candy wrappers and paper on the floor.

The questions put to the students by the teachers were:

1. Should Bill feel any responsibility or pride about what he observed?
2. What could or should Bill do about each of the described problems that he observed?

In concluding this lab session, each team was asked to respond to a list of topics and subtopics with a check (✓) if they felt strong school pride in Bill's day and with an (x) on the topics and subtopics the team felt needed improvement.

In the thirteenth student lab session and the last activity using the Pride and Responsibility Booklet, the teachers reviewed with the students the check list from the previous session. The teachers then asked each student to choose one topic the student felt needed improvement in the area of pride and responsibility. Each student was to discuss the topic with his/her team. The teams thus discussed an individual's responsibility for improving the weaknesses and what team efforts could do to improve the weaknesses. Each team listed the steps needed to reach their goal -- what, how, where, when, and by whom. In summary, the experimental teachers reviewed the many ways the students had listed as ways they could show pride in their school. These and the steps of responsibility to improve school pride were listed on butcher paper taped on the chalk guard. The paper was later rolled up and kept to be reviewed again toward the close of the elementary LIFE porgram.

The next phase of implementation was held in each experimental school. The experimental school principals met with their respective teachers to discuss the next lab booklet, "Expectations of Self and Others," and the various objectives or outcomes expected from the adaptation of this secondary level booklet to meet the needs of the elementary students.

During the fourteenth session of implementation of the LIFE program within the experimental schools social studies classes, the teachers gave their students the lab booklet, Expectations of Self and Others. The teachers then discussed the objectives of this booklet with their students. These were:

1. To recognize commonalities and differences in expectations.
2. To identify relevant and non-relevant learning expectations of self and others.

The first activity of this booklet was to teach the students to recognize the first-, second-, and third-person forms for certain words. The teachers explained that the use of I, you, and he/she requires that a distinction be made in verbs (I am, you are, he is) and pronouns (this is mine, this is yours, this is his). The teachers further explained that people carry this idea further when they state, "I benefit; you come out okay; but he, the third person who isn't within earshot, really gets it." To demonstrate the idea, teachers listed on the board several examples of this "I am, you are, and he/she is "concept. They were listed as follows:

I am	You are	He/she is
slender	thin	skinny
perfect	neat	fussy
frank	candid	blunt
aware of my worth	proud	conceited
concerned	interested	a busy-body

Students within each of their groups were then asked to add to the lists. The teachers tried to get the students to see that this condition might be termed as "uneven associations." It was defined that I = self, you and I = we, and he/she usually = others. The teachers explained that expectations of self and others motivate a person's actions in most association situations.

In the next student lab session, the teachers reviewed the previous session on "uneven associations." They then related to the students three types of expectations between self and others:

1. Depose: Take away expectations of others.
   Example given: Insisting upon calling a person John, when he prefers the name Juan.
2. Impose: Put your expectations on others.
   Example given: Do it my way or else!
3. Expose: State your own expectations at that time only
   Example given: I prefer to do it this way.

The students then joined their respective groups and listed as individuals some of the self-expectations they were looking for by attending school today. After the individual listing, members of each group were asked to share with other members of their groups, comparing lists to see which expectations were common to others and which were different.

As a final activity from the lab booklet, Expectations of Self and Others, the students were asked to again discuss the differences in their self-expectation and what affect these differences would have upon others. Finally, the groups were joined together to share their individual group conclusions with the class as a whole.

Before implementing the next LIFE lab booklet, Citizenship and Youth, the experimental principals met with their respective teachers to discuss the expected outcome to be covered in this booklet. The three following objectives to be derived from the booklet were discussed:

1. To reinforce the two-way relationship in a democracy.
2. To develop citizenship decision-making privileges with responsibilities.
3. To focus upon supportive citizenship roles of youth today.

The teachers were instructed to begin implementation of the "Citizenship and Youth Lab Booklet" the next day in their social studies classes. Lab booklets for each of their students were given to the teacher in order that each student could have a personal copy.

The first activity of this lab booklet was a teacher-led class discussion concerning student awareness of some of the problems of society and problems that students are confronted with on a day-to-day basis. Examples of such problems included pollution, the energy crisis, violence, neglect, waste, hate, and discrimination. It was explained that many times the students might feel powerless to solve any of these problems and that such a feeling might lead to confusion, frustration, and alienation. The teachers discussed with the students how some youths tried to escape these problems by means of drugs, while others tried to "beat the system" by other illegal acts. The teachers' goal was to make the students see that there is a better way to deal with such problems within the law. It was explained that citizens and governments have a two-way relationship through which they should work to correct wrongs. In addition, teachers reminded students that voting opportunities had been lowered to age 18, emphasizing that it would not be too many years before each student would have the voting privilege

and responsibility.

The chart below was discussed since each student had a copy of this chart to help clarify the two-way (government-citizen) relationship concept in their minds.

Citizens	Government
Voting Citizens	Elected citizens
Change: Request change of laws	Change: Make new laws
Order: Obey laws	Order: Enforce laws

During the next lab session the teachers discussed with the students the concept of "decision-making." A "five-way test" to help in the making of decision was listed on the chalk board as follows:

1. Is it the truth?
2. Is it fair to all concerned?
3. Will it build goodwill and better friendship?
4. Will it be beneficial to all concerned?
5. Is it within our laws or policies?

Both the experimental-school principals and the experimental-school teachers felt that discussion of these issues was one of the more important experiences that the students could gain from this particular LIFE booklet, and that the "five-way test" would carry over into all phases of improved student attitudes.

After the class discussions, the students separated into their groups and were given questions to discuss. Examples of these questions were:

1. Why do we have stop signs on our streets?
2. Should stop signs be removed?

3. Why do we have laws?

4. Why do we have school rules?

5. Does breaking school rules on purpose occur?

6. Can the right to break laws or rules to satisfy self's or friend's desire be justified?

After the individual group discussions, the class re-formed and each group presented its responses to those questions to the whole class. The teacher then instructed the students to think about which school rules were broken most often and the reasons for those broken rules, and to be prepared to share their ideas during the next session.

In that next session, the teachers used a Hilda Taba strategy of listing on the board the rules most often broken as stated by the students. In another column, the teacher listed student opinions as to why the previously listed rules were being broken. This strategy aimed at making each student think and respond and also at exhausting all their responses. No response was rejected.

After this activity, the groups were asked to discuss the word "freedom," what it means to be free, the things that make them feel the most free, and whether they were more free at home or at school. Discussion was stimulated by direct questions such as "Do you know anyone who is absolutely free? How so? Is there anything more important to you than being free?"

The teachers in the next session read the following situation to their students:

What's Your Excuse?

(Folklore)

"My dear friend," said a neighbor, "I wish I could oblige you by lending you that axe. Unfortunately, I must refuse to lend it to you because I need it to mend my coat."

"You need an axe to mend your coat?" protested the borrower. "You can't mend your coat with an axe."

"Of course I can't," agreed the neighbor, but when I don't want to do a thing, any excuse is okay."

The teachers defined the situation as one where a person does not want to do something for another, but realizes that his excuse is a silly one. The question put forth by the teachers at this point was: "How often do we ourselves fail to do what should have been done, even when it's to our advantage, and then dream up all kinds of ridiculous excuses so we can pretend to ourselves that we are acting sensibly?"

The students were then asked, as individuals, to list some excuses that other students had given to them or their teachers when they had failed to do what they should have done. The teachers then asked the students to share some of their listings with the class. The strategy here was aimed at helping the students to realize that people should strive to get along without making excuses, and to see that they have responsibilities that they must face up to without

trying to make excuses.

In concluding the sessions in the Citizenship and Youth Life Booklet, the teacher summarized that citizenship is a two-way relationship and that to give the "five way test" to themselves was important before making decisions and to strive to get away from making excuses.

Before implementing the last interaction lab booklet. Do Something Beautiful, the experimental school principals met to decide which activities could be adopted from this secondary LIFE booklet because the end of the practicum was near; there was not enough time to implement all the activities. It was decided that there could be only two interaction lab sessions, plus two sessions to get ideas on Do Something Beautiful projects.

The experimental school principals met with their respective teachers to explain the two selected activities and to discuss how to involve students in a project for each individual school. The first activity from the Do Something Beautiful Booklet was that entitled, "Little Things Mean a Lot." The other and final activity was to promote student involvement in a youth project that would be beautiful for the school. Each experimental school would have its own youth projects but the keynote for all would be student involvement.

In the session with their students on "Little Things Mean a Lot," the experimental school teachers presented the ideas that all things are within reach but that little things are often overlooked; however, taking care of the little things will often make a big difference in the big things. The teachers then di ided the students

into their usual groups to discuss the following questions:

1. How do you say "hello" to each other?
2. How do you speak to your teachers?
3. How do you show your teacher that he/she is "somebody?"
4. How do you welcome new students?
5. How do you welcome new teachers?
6. How do you report bad news?
7. How do you report good news?
8. How do you explain what your school stands for?
9. How do you involve students?
10. How do you involve teachers?
11. How do you inform your parents about your school?
12. How do you introduce new ideas?
13. How do you put some pride in your school?

At the conclusion of this activity, each of the group recorders shared their group's discussion of "little things" with the entire class.

Then group session efforts were devoted to a brain storming session in which the students were instructed to think of ideas to "Do Something Beautiful" for their school and/or community. Their ideas were written down on sentence strips of tagboard by each group's recorder. At the end of each session, these strips of tagboard were tacked on the classroom bulletin boards and chalk boards for all the students to see and think about. Those ideas unique to a particular class were also shared with the other grade classes of each experimental school. It was decided that at the next session of the LIFE labs the students would vote on which idea they thought would be best for their particular school. The overall purpose of this activity was to get

students involved in "Doing Something Beautiful." It was also hoped that the project would instill students with pride in their school and give them a sense of school unity.

At T. L. Marsalis Elementary School, the idea gaining the most votes was to invite all the grandmothers living in the community to be present at the "Awards Day Program," held during the last week of school. An hour lab session was used to plan the event. At the "Awards Day Program" the grandmothers were recognized by seating them in a special section of the auditorium and having them introduced. A special corsage was given to the oldest grandmother present. The winning grandmother was ninety-one years old. A total of twenty-four grandparents attended. After the ceremonies the students agreed the invitation to grandmothers should be part of the annual "Awards Day Program". This successful project culminated the year's LIFE Leadership activities for the T. L. Marsalis Elementary School.

At the Nancy Jane Cochran Elementary School the idea gaining the most votes was to have a family-night dinner where food dishes from the Mexican-American families, the Negro families, the Indian families, and the Anglo families were shared. The dinner was held in the school cafeteria. A large turnout of families was present. Each family brought its speciality dishes, and a nominal fee of seventy-five cents was charged per person for the meal. The proceeds were donated to the school to buy some trees to beautify the school campus. Since the Nancy J. Cochran school was only seven years old, there was a need for additional trees to beautify the campus. A total of $175 was raised to buy the trees. In addition, the family night dinner also seemed to

bring about a "togetherness" on the part of the school and the school community. This successful affair ended the year's LIFE Leadership activities at Nancy J. Cochran Elementary School.

At the Seagoville Elementary School the winning idea was to increase attendance at the P.T.A. meetings the next school year by having the fourth grade adopt their parents and bring them to P.T.A. meetings. In effect, the idea was to convert the meetings for the next year into a Parent, Teacher, Student Association. It was decided that the fourth grade would spearhead the attempt. They would volunteer to be in charge of at least one P.T.A. meeting. Students would also participate in other meetings by singing on the program, by giving the inspirational part, and so on. It was thought that this student involvement on the programs would increase attendance and would instill more pride in the students in their school.

Posttesting

The experimental schools' "Do Something Beautiful" projects brought classroom implementation of the elementary LIFE Leadership Program to a successful conclusion. Implementation of the practicum was concluded with the administration of posttests to the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades of both the experimental and control schools on May 27, 1975. The results of that posttesting are discussed in the following evaluation section.

EVALUATION

Purpose of the Evaluation

The evaluation was conducted to determine the extent to which the elementary LIFE Leadership Program was successful in realizing

its stated objectives and also to determine other information of potential value in further implementation of the program.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design was primarily a pretest-posttest design. Process evaluation was done by classroom observation, teacher-student interview, and examination of office records concerning disciplinary referrals.

The major questions to be answered by the evaluation were:

1. Did the participating students in the experimental schools show an improvement in attitude as measured by the pre- and post-attitudinal test when compared with participating students from the control schools?
2. Did 75 percent of the pilot fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students in the experimental schools indicate a positive change in attitude?
3. Did experimental school records reveal a decrease of those indicators of negative student attitudes (i.e., corporal punishment, suspension, theft, vandalism, fighting, extortion, and insubordination.)

Evaluation Instruments

Elementary Pupil Questionnaire. This is a test composed of twenty-four items selected from various attitude tests supplied by Region Ten Service Center. (see Appendix A). The questions were designed to access students' attitudes toward peers, teachers, and administrators. This questionnaire was the instrument used in both the pre- and posttesting.

Disciplinary Records. These are standardized forms kept by each principal in regard to student problems resulting in an office referral. A duplicate of this form is in Appendix E.

Observations. Periodic observations were made by experimental school principals in their respective schools. Question-and-answer interviews of students and teachers by experimental school principals in their respective schools attempted to determine the effectiveness of the program.

Test Dates. The pretest was administered to all participating students on January 8, 1975. The posttest was administered on May 27, 1975 to all participating students.

Criteria

The criteria used to evaluate this practicum were:

I. Elementary Pupil Questionnaire Experimental Schools

   A. Pretest

      1. Seagoville Elementary (fourth-grade students)
      2. T. L. Marsalis Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, sixth-grade students)
      3. N. J. Cochran Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students

II. Elementary Pupil Questionnaire Control Schools

   A. Pretest

      1. Kleberg Elementary (fourth-grade students)
      2. M. Twain Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students
      3. Winnetka Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade student

III. Experimental School Office Records of Incidents of Negative Student Behaviors

A. Seagoville Elementary (fourth-grade)

1. Pre-practicum-Fall, 1974 office records
2. Post-practicum-Spring, 1975 office records

B. T. L. Marsalis Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grades)

1. Pre-practicum-Fall, 1974 office records
2. Post-practicum-Spring, 1975 office records

C. N. J. Cochran Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grades)

1. Pre-practicum-Fall, 1974 office records
2. Post-practicum-Spring, 1975 office records

IV. Control schools office records of incidents of negative student behavior

A. Kleberg Elementary (fourth-grade)

1. Pre-practicum-Fall, 1974 office records
2. Post-practicum-Spring, 1975 office records

B. M. Twain Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grades)

1. Pre-practicum-Fall, 1974 office records
2. Post-practicum-Spring, 1974 office records

C. Winnetka Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, and sixth grades)

1. Pre-practicum-Fall, 1974 office records
2. Post-practicum-Spring, 1975 office records

V. Observations

A. Seagoville Elementary

1. Principal
2. Teacher
3 Student

B. T. L. Marsalis Elementary

1. Principal
2. Teacher
3. Student

C. N. J. Cochran Elementary

1. Principal
2. Teacher
3. Student

Collection of Data

All data concerning the tabulation of the Elementary Pupil Questionnaire and office records of incidents of negative student behavior were collected by the experimental school principals from all teachers and office recorder at their school and from the principals of the control schools.

I. Elementary Pupil Questionnaire

A. Experimental Schools

1. Seagoville Elementary (fourth grade)

a. Pretest
   1. Administered prior to program
   2. Totals tabulated to determine the mean score of the fourth grade

b. Posttest
   1. Administered at the end of the program
   2. Totals tabulated to determine the mean score of the fourth grade

c. Pretest and posttest scores of the fourth-grade students were compared to determine the percent of students whose score increased from pre- to posttesting

2. T. L. Marsalis Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grades)

a. Pretest
   1. administered prior to program
   2. totals tabulated to determine the mean scores of the fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grades.

b. Posttest
   1. administered at the end of the program
   2. totals tabulated to determine the mean scores of the fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-, grades

c. Pretest and posttest scores of the fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students were compared to determine the percent of students whose score increased from pre- to posttesting

3. N. J. Cochran Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grades)

a. Pretest

1. administered prior to program
2. totals tabulated to determine the mean scores of the fourth-, fifth- and sixth-grades

b. Posttest

1. administered at the end of the program
2. totals tabulated to determine the mean scores of the fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grades.

c. Pretest and posttest scores of the fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students were compared to determine the percent of students whose score increased from pre- to posttesting

B. Control Schools

1. Kleberg Elementary (fourth grade)

a. Pretest

1. administered prior to the program
2. totals tabulated to determine the mean score of the fourth grade

b. Posttest

1. administered at the end of the program
2. totals tabulated to determine the score of the fourth grade

c. Pretest and posttest scores of the fourth-grade students were compared to determine the percent of students whose scores increased from pre- to posttesting

2. M. Twain Elementary (fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grades)

a. Pretest

1. administered prior to the program.
2. totals tabulated to determine the mean scores of the fourth, fifth and sixth grades

2. T. L. Marsalis Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

   a. Pre-practicum records-Fall, 1974 office records

      1. compiled prior to the program
      2. totals tabulated to determine the number of incidents of negative student behavior

   b. Post-practicum records-Spring, 1975

      1. compiled at the end of the program
      2. totals tabulated to determine the number of incidents of negative student behavior

3. N. J. Cochran Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

   a. Pre-practicum records-Fall, 1974
      1. compiled prior to the program
      2. totals tabulated to determine the number of incidents of negative student behavior

   b. Post-practicum records-Spring, 1975 office records
      1. compiled at the end of the program
      2. totals tabulated to determine the number of incidents of negative student behavior

B. Control schools

1. Kleberg Elementary (fourth grade)

   a. Pre-practicum records-Fall, 1974 office records

      1. compiled prior to the program
      2. totals tabulated to determine the number of incidents of negative student behavior

   b. Post-practicum records-Spring, 1975 office records
      1. compiled at the end of the program
      2. totals tabulated to determine the number of incidents of negative student behavior

2. M. Twain Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

   a. Pre-practicum records-Fall, 1974 office records

1. compiled prior to the program
2. totals tabulated to determine the number of incidents of negative student behavior

b. Post-practicum record-Spring, 1975 office records

1. compiled at the end of the program
2. totals tabulated to determine the number of incidents of negative student behavior

3. Winnetka Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

a. Pre-practicum records-Fall, 1974 office records

1. compiled prior to the program
2. totals tabulated to determine the number of incident of negative student behavior

b. Post-practicum records-Spring, 1975 office records

1. compiled at the end of the program
2. total tabulated to determine the number of incidents of negative student behavior

III. Observations by Principals, Teachers and Students were Collected by Experimental School Principals From Their Respective Schools

Analysis of Data

Using the above criteria, the following data were secured from analyzing the tables on pages 92-94.

I. Table One - Elementary Pupil Questionnaire Mean Scores

A. Experimental schools

1. Seagoville Elementary (fourth grade)

a. Pretest mean score	65.2
b. Posttest mean score	76.6
c. Difference	+11.4

2. T. L. Marsalis Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

a. Pretest mean score	70.97
b. Posttest mean score	71.80
c. Difference	+ .83

3. N. J. Cochran Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

a. Pretest mean score	70.6
b. Posttest mean score	72.2
c. Difference	+ 1.6

4. Experimental school composite mean scores

a. Pretest mean score	70.0
b. Posttest mean score	72.9
c. Difference	+ 2.9

B. Control schools

1. Kleberg Elementary (fourth grade)

a. Pretest mean score	69.4
b. Posttest mean score	63.2
c. Difference	- 6.2

2. M. Twain Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

a. Pretest mean score	70.1
b. Posttest mean score	68.5
c. Difference	- 1.6

3. Winnetka Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

a. Pretest mean score	68.4
b. Posttest mean score	66.2
c. Difference	- 2.2

4. Control school composite mean score

a. Pretest mean score	69.2
b. Posttest mean score	66.7
c. Difference	- 2.5

II. Table Two - Participant Gains From Pretest to Posttest

A. Experimental schools

1. Seagoville Elementary (fourth grade)

   a. number of participants showing gain 91
   b. percent of participants showing gain 61.4%

2. T. L. Marsalis Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

   a. number of participants showing gain 181
   b. percent of participants showing gain 56.3%

3. N. J. Cochran Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

   a. number of participants showing gain 132
   b. percent of participants showing gain 61.3%

4. Experimental school composite

   a. number of participants showing gain 404
   b. percent of participants showing gain 59%

B. Control Schools

1. Kleberg Elementary (fourth grade)

   a. number of participants showing gain 12
   b. percent of participants showing gains 10.1%

2. M. Twain Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

   a. number of participants showing gain 37
   b. percent of participants observing gain 11.3%

3. Winnetka Elementary (fourth, fifth and sixth grades)

   a. number of participants showing gain 28
   b. percent of participants showing gain 13.9%

4. Control school composite

   a. number of participants showing gain 77
   b. percent of participants showing gain 11.9%

III. Table Three - Incidents of Negative Student Behavior of Participating Students

A. Experimental schools

1. Seagoville Elementary (fourth grade)

a. Pre-practicum incidents 107
b. Post-practicum incidents 78
c. Percent of decrease 27.2%

2. T. L. Marsalis Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

a. Pre-practicum incidents 295
b. Post-practicum incidents 130
c. Percent of decrease 56%

3. N. J. Cochran Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

a. Pre-practicum incidents 315
b. Post-practicum incidents 260
c. Percent of decrease 17.5%

B. Control schools

1. Kleberg Elementary (fourth grade)

a. Pre-practicum incidents 156
b. Post-practicum incidents 157
c. Percent of increase .7%

2. M. Twain Elementary (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades)

a. Pre-practicum incidents 165
b. Post-practicum incidents 261
c. Percent of increase 36.8%

3. Winnetka

a. Pre-practicum incidents 271
b. Post-practicum incidents 321
c. Percent of increase 15.6%

Table 1

Elementary Pupil Questionnaire Results
Mean Scores

Experimental Schools	Grade Level	Number of Participants*		Pretest		Posttest		Difference
Seagoville	4th	148		65.2		76.6		+11.4
T. L. Marsalis	4th	100		69.7		70.9		+ 1.2
	5th	105		71.3		71.9		+ .6
	6th (321)**	116	(70.97)**	71.9	(71.8)**	72.6	(+.83)**	+ .7
N. J. Cochran	4th	70		67.2		69.1		+ 1.9
	5th	74		7[illegible].8		72.6		+ 1.8
	6th (215)**	71	(70.6)**	73.9	(72.2)**	75.0	(+1.6)**	+ 1.1
Totals	7	684		490.0		508.7		+18.7
Composite Mean (Experimental School)				70.0		72.9		+ 2.9

Control Schools	Grade Level	Number of Participants*		Pretest		Posttest		Difference
Kleberg	4th	118		69.4		63.2		- 6.2
M. Twain	4th	112		68.7		67.3		- 1.4
	5th	109		70.6		68.8		- 1.8
	6th (327)**	106	(70.1)**	71.1	(68.5)**	69.5	(-1.6)**	- 1.6
Winnetka	4th	68		69.1		66.4		- 2.7
	5th	67		67.6		65.7		- 1.9
	6th (201)**	66	(68.4)**	68.4	(66.2)**	66.4	(-2.2)**	- 2.0
Totals	7	646		484.9		467.3		-17.6
Composite Mean (Control School)				69.2		66.7		- 2.5

*Average number of participants taking pre- and posttest.

**Numbers in parentheses are individual school totals.

Table 2

Participant Gains from Pretest to Posttest

Experimental Schools	Grade Level		Number of Participants*		Number of Participants Showing Gain		Percent of Increase
Seagoville	4th		148		91		.614
Marsalis	4th		100		57		.57
	5th		105		61		.58
	6th	(321)**	116	(181)**	63	(.513)**	.543
Cochran	4th		70		44		.628
	5th		74		42		.567
	6th	(215)**	71	(132)**	46	(.613)**	.647
Totals	7		684		404		.59

Percentage of Experimental School Participants Showing Gain 59%

Control Schools	Grade Level		Number of Participants*		Number of Participants Showing Gain		Percent of Increase
Kleberg	4th		118		12		.101
M. Twain	4th		112		13		.116
	5th		109		14		.128
	6th	(327)**	106	(37)**	10	(.113)**	.094
Winnetka	4th		68		11		.161
	5th		67		8		.119
	6th	(201)**	66	(28)**	9	(13.9)**	.136
Totals			646		77		.119

Percentage of Control School Participants Showing Gain 11.9%

Differences in Experimental and Control School Percentage 48.1%

*Average number of participants taking the pre- and posttest.

**Numbers in parentheses are individual school totals.

Table 3

Incidents of Negative Student Behavior of Participating Students

Experimental Schools

Behavioral Item	Seagoville			T. L. Marsalis			N. J. Cochran		
	Fall 1974	Spring 1975	Percent of Change	Fall 1974	Spring 1975	Percent of Change	Fall 1974	Spring 1975	Percent of Change
Corporal Punishment	5	3	-.40	192	85	-.559	191	174	-.09
Suspensions	0	0	0	5	2	-.6	6	3	-.5
Student Fights	23	15	-.348	31	15	-.517	25	21	-.16
Insubordination	75	60	-.20	45	22	-.512	71	48	-.323
Theft	4	0	-4.0	10	3	-.7	15	10	-.333
Extortion	0	0	0	4	1	-.75	2	1	-.50
Vandalism	0	0	0	8	2	-.75	5	3	-.40
Total Teacher Office Referrals	107	78	-.272	295	130	-.56	315	260	-.175
Participants		145*			323*			221*	
Grades		4th			4th-6th			4th-6th	

Control Schools

Behavioral Item	Kleberg			M. Twain			Winnetka		
	Fall 1974	Spring 1975	Percent of Change	Fall 1974	Spring 1975	Percent of Change	Fall 1974	Spring 1975	Percent of Change
Corporal Punishment	25	30	+.167	70	182	+.616	185	220	+.16
Suspension	0	0	0	4	12	+.666	8	12	+.333
Student Fights	30	35	+.143	25	28	+.108	28	32	+.125
Insubordination	90	85	-.056	40	54	+.26	18	21	+.141
Theft	8	7	-.125	12	10	-.167	21	24	+.168
Extortion	0	0	0	3	5	+.40	5	8	+.375
Vandalism	3	0	-3.0	7	10	+.30	6	4	-.333
Total Teacher Office Referrals	156	157	+.007	165	261	+.368	271	321	+.156
Participants		115*			331*			206*	
Grades		4th			4th-6th			4th-6th	

*Average number of participating students Fall, 1974 - Spring, 1975.

Conclusions

From the analysis of the data and from the observation of the experimental school principals, the following conclusions were made:

1. The composite mean test scores of the experimental schools showed positive gains from pre- to posttesting on the Elementary Pupil Questionnaire Table 1 (page 92). The control school composite mean test scores showed a decline on the same pre- to posttesting. Comparing experimental schools to their respective control school by grade level reveals that in every grade the experimental schools showed a positive gain in mean score from pre- to posttesting while the control schools showed a decline in mean score from pre- to posttesting. The gains from pretest to posttest are not astounding when considered in and of themselves, but they take on added merit when compared to the results from control school students whose decline in posttest scores indicated a negative change in attitude. A decline is not unreasonable or unexpected if one considers that the posttest was given in May when the possibility of declining student and teacher interest exist. The experimental school posttest gain is thus even more creditable.
2. The data in Table 2 (page 93) reveals that 59 percent of the participants in the experimental schools showed a gain in scores from pre- to posttesting on the Elementary Questionnaire as compared to the 11.9 percent gain in scores

from pre- to posttesting for participants in the control schools. The data reveals that 48.1 percent more participants made gains in the experimental school than in the control schools. In comparing each corresponding participating grade level in the experimental schools with those of the control schools, it is revealed that at least 38 percent more participants in experimental schools showed gain in scores from pre- to posttesting. The highest percent of increase of student scores in any one participating grade level in the experimental schools was 64.7 percent recorded at N. J. Cochran Elementary in the sixth grade. The lowest percent of increase of student scores in any one participating grade level in the control schools was 9.4 percent recorded at M. Twain Elementary in the sixth grade. An original stated objective of the program was that 75 percent of those students participating in the LIFE Leadership Program should show a positive gain in attitude. That objective was not realized. The authors of this practicum, however, felt that the 59 percent gain was in itself impressive enough to warrant further implementation of the program.

3. A comparison of pre-practicum to post-practicum records of the experimental schools in Table 3 (page 94) revealed that all experimental schools showed a decrease in incidents of negative student behavior. On the same table all control schools showed an increase in incidents of negative student

behavior. In comparing Seagoville Elementary with its control school Kleberg Elementary it is revealed that Seagoville Elementary showed a 27.2 percent decrease in incidents and Kleberg Elementary showed a .07 percent increase in incidents. In comparing T. L. Marsalis Elementary with its control school M. Twain Elementary it is revealed that T. L. Marsalis Elementary showed a 56 percent decrease in incidents and M. Twain Elementary showed a 35.8 percent increase in incidents. In comparing N. J. Cochran Elementary with its control school Winnetka Elementary it is revealed that N. J. Cochran Elementary showed a 17.5 percent decrease in incidents and Winnetka Elementary showed a 15.6 percent increase in incidents. It is interesting to note that none of the experimental schools showed any increase in any of the areas representing incidents of negative student behavior. Concerning the control schools it is also interesting to note that Kleberg Elementary showed a decrease of 5.6 percent in the area of Insubordination and a 12.5 percent decrease in the area of theft. M. Twain Elementary also showed a decrease of 16.7 percent in the area of theft. Winnetka Elementary showed a decrease of 33 percent in the area of vandalism. The decrease in incidents of negative student behavior which was evidenced in the experimental schools as compared to the overall increase in incidents of negative student behavior evidenced in the control schools also suggest that the Elementary LIFE Leadership program affected student

attitude positively.

4. Principal observations and teacher-student interviews indicated a positive response to the LIFE Leadership Program. Examples of feedback from teachers and students and statements from the experimental school principals are listed below:

   A. Seagoville

      1. George Simms - principal. "The format of this program is excellent. Student response was more enthusiastic than expected. The activities in book 1-E, Elementary Life Leadership were especially well-adapted to this level and results were evident in the halls and lunchroom particularly."

      2. Mrs. Wright - teacher (fourth grade). "The students' reaction to this program was gratifying. Although some modification of materials will be necessary for this age level, I feel that this attempt is a step in the right direction."

      3. Cynthia Garrett - student. "I enjoyed being in this program. I think all students need to think about how we act toward other students and teachers."

   B. T. L. Marsalis

      1. Earl Beesley - principal. "I enjoyed working with my upper-grade teachers in the LIFE Leadership Program for our school. I feel it was very beneficial to our teachers as well as our students, and it seemed to help the whole atmosphere of our school even the final few weeks before school ended. There

were definitely fewer discipline problems than in the fall semester."

2. Barbara Berger - teacher (fifth grade). "I feel that the students who were exposed to the LIFE Leadership Program have definitely become more aware of their responsibility as students and how they can help make the school a better place to be in. Their attitude toward other students, toward our school, and toward me as a teacher seemed to improve the more we worked in our group dynamics of the LIFE Leadership Program. The program really helped our classroom climate, and I am looking forward to continuing next year."

3. Karen Hodge - student (fifth grade)
"The group work was a lot of fun and our teacher really worked with us. We got to say what we think about our school and how we can help make it better. All of us became better friends."

C. Nancy J. Cochran

1. Marcus Gifford - principal. "I thought the program was very successful. The enthusiasm among students was catching. I especially enjoyed the portion of the program where students had an opportunity to ask me questions. They really came up with some very good questions. I am looking forward to an improved program next year."

2. Barbara Wright - teacher (sixth grade). "I was a little apprehensive concerning the LIFE Leadership Program. The workshop was long, but the information was impressive. I enjoyed the Program after the initial training period. The students would not let me forget the scheduled time period."

3. Vanata Green - student (sixth grade). "I really didn't know what the teacher was trying to do at first. We broke down into groups and talked about different things, 'being friendly,' 'being good sports,' etc. We had a lot of fun asking questions from Mr. Gifford, etc."

5. The evaluation revealed some positive student outcomes that were indications of increased positive attitudes on their part. For instance, in the experimental schools lunchrooms, behavior improved when students took the initiative in reducing line skipping, in raising hands for quiet when classmates because too noisy, and in volunteering to clean tables. Further student initiative was indicated in two of the experimental schools with volunteer hall and playground patrols and student-instigated cleanup programs.

6. Future plans for the program call for a project manager to provide more teacher contact between principals and teachers, with the idea of improving the flow of materials to the classroom. There was a general feeling at the fourth-grade level

that students were perhaps too young for the present format. Nonetheless, teachers generally expressed the opinion that the program was necessary at the fourth-grade level and that adaption of the program's present format could probably easily be effected by simply increasing the emphasis upon teacher direction at the fourth-grade level.

7. The original time limits for lab sessions were considered to be impractical. Two hours per week in lab sessions were deemed excessive. Therefore, in the latter weeks of the practicum the lab sessions were reduced to one hour per week.
8. As a result of this practicum, the authors have made the following recommendations to the Facilitator of the LIFE Leadership Program:
    1. More extensive staff development and program orientation for teachers.
    2. Increased administrative support from area coordinators at the classroom level.
    3. Continuously updating and revision of materials.
    4. Improvement of the process of material dissimination.
    5. Formation of a League of LIFE Leadership Schools with the objectives of conducting workshops and sharing ideas with schools implementing the program.

SUMMARY

In summary, this practicum was an attempt to change the attitudes of fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students toward school, teachers, and administrators. The use of the LIFE Leadership Program to accomplish this end was found to be very workable. It is the viewpoint of the authors, as evidenced by the evaluation, that this program was successful.

As a result of this practicum, the LIFE Leadership Program in DISD elementary schools will be continued in the three experimental schools. In addition, the program has been extended intact to four other elementary schools, namely, Winnetka, Robert E. Lee, B. H. Macon, and Anson Jones.

Bibliography

Beers, J. S. & Reardon, F. J. Achievement and attitudinal changes associated with school district reorganization, April, 1974, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 094 021).

Boyd, J. D. & Bowers, R. A. Behavioral analysis: The principal and discipline, The Clearing House, 1974, XLVIII.

Brown, S. M. From the kids point of view, Reading Newsreport, 1972, 7(1), 40-44.

Calkins, J. E. Are your students involved in deciding crucial issues? NASSP Bulletin, 1974, LVIII, 13-24.

Ferinden, W. E., Jr. Classroom management through the application of behavior modification techniques. Linden, N. J., Remediation Institution, Inc., n.d., (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 073 392).

Gable, R. K., & Roberts, A. D. The development of an instrument to measure attitudes toward school subjects. n.p., n.d. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 079 326).

Hops, H., & Cobb, J. A. Survival behaviors in the educational setting: Their implications for research and intervention, Department of Special Education, Report No. 13, Oregon University, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 069 091).

Mackey, J. A. Studying the school in the classroom. Social Studies, 1972, 63(7), 317-321.

McKeen, C., et al. Peer interaction rate, classroom activity and teaching style. Oregon University: Center at Oregon for Research, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 072 210).

Murry, E. Students' perceptions of self-actualization and non-self-actualizing teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1972, 23(3), 383-388.

Rosen, P. Attitudes toward school and school adjustment grades 4-6. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Services, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 083 321).

Sherman, T. M., et al. An investigation of the influencing of student behavior on teacher behavior, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 075 387).

Wilkins, W. E. Teacher expectations and classroom behavior. Brockport: State University of New York, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 090 236).